

**IN DIALOGUE WITH ENGLISH MODERNISM: STORM
JAMESON'S EARLY FORMATION AS A WRITER, 1919-1931**

Deborah Frances Gerrard

De Montfort University

January 2010

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

For Prue and Julia

Abstract

After a period during which Storm Jameson's restricted literary identity has been that of the politically engaged woman writer, critical interest in the intellectual and stylistic complexities of her work is now reviving. Yet Jameson's background in early English modernism and the manner in which it enriches her writing continues to pass unnoticed. This thesis uncovers new evidence of Jameson's immersion in the early English modernisms of Alfred Orage's Leeds Arts Club and *New Age* journal and of Dora Marsden's journals, the *New Freewoman* and the *Egoist*, as an avant-garde student before the Great War. Drawing analogies with the post-colonial notions of 'Manichean delirium' and of 'writing back to the centre', this thesis argues that, subsequently – as a provincial socialist woman writer struggling to make her way at the predominantly male and elitist cultural centre – Jameson developed a vexed outsider-insider relation to English modernism which she expressed during the 1920s in a series of intertextual novels critiquing the contemporary cultural scene. It examines each of these novels chronologically, beginning with Jameson's critique of the early modernisms of Orage, Marsden and associated writers in her first two novels, before moving on to her engagement, in turn, with the work of D. H. Lawrence, Virginia Woolf and Wyndham Lewis. Employing a socially oriented model of intertextuality, this thesis reads each novel synchronically as a sceptical and often witty probing of some of the polarised, and frequently contradictory, positions taken within the modernist debate. It also interprets the 1920s fiction diachronically as a developmental journey towards what Jennifer Birkett terms the 'stylised realism' of the 1930s and 40s, in which William James's Pragmatism plays a central role, allowing Jameson to assimilate those intellectual and stylistic elements within English modernism that she values before leaving the rest behind.

Acknowledgements

I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Julia Briggs, a wonderful supervisor and dear friend to whose loving memory (in company with that of my mother, Prue) this thesis is dedicated, and to Andrew Thacker, who stepped in and guided me to the finish with such knowledgeable advice, patience and good humour.

I am also indebted to the following generous individuals for professional help, advice, inspiration and encouragement of various kinds: Humaira Ahmed, Rebecca Beasley, Ian Bell, Jennifer Birkett, Chiara Briganti, Cathy Clay, Paul Edwards, Peregrine Horden, Mary Joannou, Lena Kore-Schroder, Henry Mead, Michael Whitworth, and John Wood.

I would like to thank the University Libraries of Leeds, Edinburgh, Warwick and Princeton, the British Library and the British Newspaper Library at Colindale for granting me access to papers and archives related to this thesis and also the 'country members' staff at the London Library for their invaluable efficient and friendly service.

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of friends and family members. Amongst many endlessly patient friends, some of whom have greeted my endeavours with real interest, others with bemused tolerance, Jane Hodge, Morag Jordan and Kathy Roberts deserve special thanks for acts of kindness that have buoyed me up during moments of difficulty and doubt. Equally, special thanks are due to my father, Peter, my sister, Phyllida, and my brother, Hugo, for their staunch loyalty and support. And thanks most of all to Philip, Simon and Jamie, whose endless love and support cannot be quantified.

Finally, my grandmother, Hilda, should not be forgotten, for it was she who ardently believed that the much loved work of her old friend and fellow northerner should be rescued from its unmerited neglect and who pushed me towards playing my part. Time and changes in critical fashion have granted Hilda's wish; I wish that she were still around to read my small contribution to Storm's rescue.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations	
Introduction	1
1 Whitby, Leeds, London: Jameson's Journey into Modernism	25
Introduction	25
A Divided Childhood	26
Leeds and Social Transformation: 1909–1912	32
Apollonian London and Aesthetic Modernism: Autumn 1912–April 1914	47
Conclusion	56
2 Reconciling Modernisms in Jameson's M.A. Thesis, 'Modern Drama in Europe' (1914)	58
Introduction	58
Early <i>New Age</i> Nietzschean-Socialism	60
Orage and Carter's Neo-Classical – or Neo-Medieval – Drama	63
Anthony Ludovici's 'Hard and Dry' Classicism	66
Edward Carpenter's Mystical Evolutionary Socialism	70
Jameson's Attitude to Women	72
Conclusion	74
3 'Master-architects': <i>The Pot Boils</i> (1919) as a Satire on <i>New Age</i> and other Early-Modernist Messianisms	76
Introduction	76
<i>The Pot Boils</i>	77
A Wellsian Pragmatism	94
Conclusion	98
4 'Freemen ... in a commonwealth of real things': Looking Back on Pre-War Dreams of Anarchism in <i>The Happy Highways</i> (1920)	100
Introduction	100
A 'Classical' Northern Childhood	104
Anarchistic Socialism in Pre-War London	105
Ideological Disillusionment and Freud's 'Blindness in Seeing Eyes'	119
The Mid-War Present and William James's Pragmatism	126
Conclusion	130
5 Violence, Difference, Women and the Gothic: Writing Back to D. H. Lawrence in <i>The Clash</i> (1922) and <i>The Pitiful Wife</i> (1923)	132
Introduction	132
Intellectual and Cultural Background	137
A Feminist Dialogue with Lawrence's 'Ethics of Alterity' in <i>The Clash</i>	146
Jameson Reading Lawrence Reading the Brontë Sisters and Ruskin in <i>The Pitiful Wife</i>	163
Conclusion	172

6	'The Battle of the Brows': Writing back to Virginia Woolf's 'Character in Fiction' (1924) and <i>Mrs Dalloway</i> (1925) in <i>Three Kingdoms</i> (1926)	173
	Prelude	173
	Introduction	174
	Writing Back to Woolf's 'Character in Fiction'	180
	Revisioning <i>Mrs Dalloway</i> , Redistributing Cultural Power	184
	Problematizing Partisan Positions	196
	Conclusion	201
7	A 'Voyage Home' from Modernism: Wyndham Lewis, William James and <i>The Triumph of Time</i> (1927–1931)	203
	Introduction	203
	<i>Time and Western Man</i> (1927)	208
	Responding to Lewis in 'The Decline of Fiction' (1929) and <i>The Georgian Novel and Mr. Robinson</i> (1929)	210
	Lewis and James in <i>The Voyage Home</i> (1930) and <i>A Richer Dust</i> (1931)	215
	Conclusion	232
	Conclusion	235
	Works Cited and Select Bibliography	242

ABBREVIATIONS

- CJ* Storm Jameson. *Civil Journey*. London: Cassell, 1939.
- GN* Storm Jameson. *The Georgian Novel and Mr. Robinson*. New York: Morrow, 1929.
- HH* Storm Jameson. *The Happy Highways*. London: Heinemann, 1920.
- JMHR* Storm Jameson. *The Journal of Mary Hervey Russell*. London: Macmillan, 1945.
- JN* Storm Jameson. *Journey From the North*. 2 vols. London: Collins and Harvill, 1969-70.
- LG* D. H. Lawrence. *The Lost Girl*. 1921. London: Penguin, 1950.
- MD* Virginia Woolf. *Mrs. Dalloway*. 1925. London: Granada, 1976.
- MDE* Storm Jameson. *Modern Drama in Europe*. London: Collins, 1920.
- NTLP* Storm Jameson. *No Time Like the Present*. London: Cassell, 1933.
- PB* Storm Jameson. *The Pot Boils*. London: Constable, 1919.
- PW* Storm Jameson. *The Pitiful Wife*. London: Constable, 1923.
- R* D. H. Lawrence. *The Rainbow*. 1915. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.
- RDP* D. H. Lawrence. *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*. 1925. Cambridge: CUP, 1988.
- SCAL* D. H. Lawrence. *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- TOT* Storm Jameson. *The Triumph of Time*. London: Heinemann, 1932.
- TWM* Wyndham Lewis. *Time and Western Man*. Santa Rosa: Black Sparrow, 1993.
- TWY* Storm Jameson. *That Was Yesterday*. 1932. New York: Berkley, 1976.
- WIL* D. H. Lawrence. *Women in Love*. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- 3Ks* Storm Jameson. *Three Kingdoms*. London: Constable, 1926.

Introduction

The conventions of the avant-garde are not less an orthodoxy. (Jameson, *Writer's* 61)

The truest eye may ... belong to the migrant's double vision. (Bhabha 7–8)

In their introduction to the first essay collection to be devoted to Storm Jameson's work, *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue* (2007), Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti observe that 'the cultural community that can read all the levels of her work is only now emerging' (1). This is particularly true of the early work, the nature of which has been obscured both by Jameson's misleading accounts of it in her various autobiographies and by her subsequent reputation as a social-realist writer. This thesis focuses on Jameson's early writing between 1919 and 1931, shortly before anti-Fascism 'swung [her] round the compass as a writer' and she began to write those social-realist novels for which she is best known (*JNI* 300).¹ In this study it is argued that what is distinctive and fascinating about her early work is the dialogue with English modernism that it develops from the perspective of a cultural outsider-insider, in Jameson's case that of a provincial socialist woman writer who had been deeply immersed in the avant-garde as a student in Leeds and London before the Great War. Excavating the relevant modernist intertexts and reading the early novels alongside them, a picture begins to emerge of the commitment, sophistication and seriousness of this dialogue, although the astuteness of Jameson's cultural-criticism-as-fiction can also be highly amusing. The rediscovery of this early work thus provides one possible answer to the question, 'What *other* aesthetic and political agendas were ... erased from cultural memory ... as the literary avant-garde achieved cultural legitimacy ...?' (Ardis, *Modernism* 7). The novels are also of value for the light they shed on so much that comes later in Jameson's work, for in them we observe how she begins to forge her identity as a writer.

1 It does not include either *That Was Yesterday* (1932) or *A Day Off* (1933), since although both these texts were written *before* Jameson returned to London to fight Fascism in 1932, they were written *after* October 1930, the moment of literary crisis during which she made the decision to 'civilize' herself as a writer (*JNI* 283). Fictions written between 1919 and 1931 that do not engage in dialogue with modernism are also excluded. These include Jameson's short stories and her novel, *Farewell to Youth* (1928).

This introduction explores some of the reasons why Jameson's early work has been underestimated and misunderstood. It discovers hidden pointers towards a revisionary reading within her several autobiographies and considers some recent critical developments – within the fields of modernist studies, postcolonial theory and intertextual theory – upon which this thesis draws in its attempt to gain a better understanding of the distinctive nature of her early achievement. It defines the kinds of English 'modernism' that are the subject of Jameson's dialogue and relates her treatment of them to the growing influence of William James's Pragmatism on her political and aesthetic thinking.² It also indicates how this study's reading of the early work relates to other revisionary work on Jameson's *oeuvre* to date.

Writing *Journey from the North* (1969–70) in the late 1960s when 'modernism' had come to dominate the critical establishment, Jameson may have felt that she had backed the wrong literary horse in becoming a 'middlebrow' socialist writer in the 1930s and may, therefore, have wanted to justify herself, or she may simply have felt that the avant-garde radicalism of her early youth was 'ridiculous in retrospect' and was therefore best left unrecorded (*NLP* 52). Whatever her motives, in *Journey* – the text for which she is best known – Jameson constructs a powerful myth of cultural ignorance and missed opportunity according to which she 'threw away' the only chance she had of joining the modernist camp in 1914. In that year she had received a job offer from Dora Marsden's important modernist journal, the *Egoist*, but – ceding to her mother's emotional blackmail – had turned it down (*JNI* 244).³ Jameson goes on to assert that her 'whole life ... would

2 For the purposes of this thesis, 'English' modernism is taken to include the work of Anglophone modernists living in England, such as Joseph Conrad, T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound, as well as that of native-born practitioners. It is also taken to include critical, political and philosophical debates associated with the early modernist journals, the *New Age*, the *New Freewoman* and the *Egoist*.

3 An earlier and milder version of the 'missed opportunity' story appears in *JMHR*, a fictionalised version of her own diary fragments in which Jameson looks to France for literary inspiration (35–6). As Jameson embroiders her tale in the much later *Journey*, factual inaccuracy begins to creep in. For example, Rebecca West did *not* take Jameson's place at the *Egoist* as the later account asserts (*JNI* 79), since by 1914 she had already finished working for Marsden as her assistant editor on the *New Freewoman* (June–September 1913).

have been different' had she 'seized this offer' and that thereafter during the 1910s and 20s she 'read little modern fiction' and 'did not so much as suspect that the gulf between Tolstoy ... and Joyce is one of intention, a choice between two ways of using language' (JNI 79, 244).

The power of this myth of the young aesthetic *ingénue* is evident when a critic as insightful as Jennifer Birkett is discovered to have accepted it unquestioningly. In the very same article in which she draws attention to the influence of French modernism on the later work, Birkett asserts that 'the English modernist novel had no impact on Jameson', citing the author's own autobiographical accounts in *Journey* and *The Journal of Mary Hervey Russell* as evidence ('Beginning' 14). Yet it would surely be surprising to find a writer so well versed in French modernism so entirely ignorant of its English equivalent. In fact, Jameson continued writing for the *Egoist* from 1914 through to 1917, making eight contributions in all and taking out an annual subscription to the journal in both December 1917 and November 1918.⁴ Furthermore, the list of 'English' modernists with whose work she was intelligently familiar in the 1910s and 20s includes E. M. Forster, Joseph Conrad, Ford Madox Ford, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, Wyndham Lewis, W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound and Hope Mirlees (plus the marginal case of D. H. Lawrence), not to mention other non-English modernist or proto-modernist writers such as Ernest Hemingway, Marcel Proust, Anton Chekhov, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Maurice Maeterlink, Henrik Ibsen, August Strindberg and Gabriele D'Annunzio. When approaching Jameson's accounts of her early literary development, it is worth bearing in mind, too, that she confessed to 'constructing' her persona as a writer (JNI 301), and that she was in the habit of making 'fresh starts, each undertaken with the same passionate intensity' (Birkett and Briganti 1).

There is a clue to the misleading nature of the afore-mentioned myth-making in an amusing scene from Jameson's much earlier third-person autobiography, *That Was Yesterday*

4 For a list of subscriptions to the *Egoist*, see the Harriet Shaw Weaver Papers. The *Egoist* folded at the end of 1919.

(1932). In this scene, the narrator mocks the grand critical ambitions of Jameson's youthful persona, Hervey, describing a notebook in which she has written the chapter headings of 'a very serious book indeed: A New Theory of Criticism' (31). Alongside the chapter headings, Hervey has written a note reminding herself to 'reread Saintsbury, Aristotle and Plato: also some moderns' (31). Both comedy and pathos here derive from the discrepancy between Hervey's large ideas and her humiliating situation as a shabby and socially inexperienced young woman living with a sexually exploitative husband and a tyrannical father-in-law in a hotel for commercial travellers. Yet the point is that, despite being young, poor and emotionally vulnerable, at this early stage in her career Jameson *did* have a sophisticated understanding of literary theory and practice, including that of 'some moderns', having emerged from the radical new University of Leeds with the top First in English, completed a comprehensive survey of modern European drama for her M.A. thesis and contributed a fair number of articles as a student to two of the foremost English early modernist journals – not only to Marsden's *Egoist* but also to Alfred Orage's *New Age*. Indeed the seriousness of Jameson's fascination with literary theory was such that over fifty years later she still regretted that she had been deflected from a career as a literary critic by the institutionalised misogyny that, with manifest injustice, awarded the only available research post at Leeds to the man who came second to her in the final examinations (Jameson, *Parthian* 7).

New Modernist Studies and Jameson's Early Modernism

A new account of the extent and sophistication of the young Jameson's understanding not only of modernist literary debates but also of the philosophical, political and psychological theories informing them has been greatly helped by recent work offering a more historically nuanced or 'thick description' of modernism than was hitherto available.⁵ Particularly useful here is work on the two early modernist journals – the *New Age* and the

5 'Thick description' is a phrase coined by Gilbert Ryle and borrowed by Ann Ardis via Clifford Geertz. See Ardis, *Modernism*, 12, n. 11.

Egoist – that Jameson read and wrote for as a student, and on Marsden’s previous journal, the *New Freewoman*, with which Jameson also appears to have been familiar. For example, this work of cultural recovery has highlighted the importance not only of Friedrich Nietzsche but also of the lesser known political and spiritual thinker, Edward Carpenter, as influences on both Orage and Marsden’s journals. It has also drawn attention to early coverage of Bergson and Freud within the *New Age* and to the part played by anarchist philosophies within the *New Freewoman* and the *Egoist*.⁶ These influences, and others emanating from the same journals, are to be found in Jameson’s ‘new age’ M.A. thesis and/or provide the intertextual focus of her first two novels based on her avant-garde student years. Some of the same influences also inform the work of the imaginative writers and aesthetic theorists that Jameson goes on to engage with in subsequent novels during the 1920s, namely, D. H. Lawrence, Virginia Woolf and Wyndham Lewis.⁷ Above all, recent work on the journals of Orage and Marsden has revealed the sheer vigorousness of their debates and the degree to which aesthetic and political questions were seen as interrelated during the early modernist period; both these traits, too, are reflected in Jameson’s early work.

Postcolonial Theory, Cultural Difference and the Spaces ‘In-Between’

Whilst it is important to bear in mind crucial differences in the scale of marginalisation and degree of suffering involved, postcolonial theory offers models that can shed extremely useful light on Jameson’s psychological, social and cultural perspective as an aspiring young socialist woman writer from the north arriving in London at a key moment in the history of modernism. In his introduction to *The Location of Culture*, Homi Bhabha notes:

6 For work on Orage and the *New Age*, see Ardis, *Modernism* and ‘Dialogics’; Fernihough, ‘Go in Fear’; Brown University’s Modern Journals Project; Martin; Steele; and Thatcher. For work on Marsden and her journals, see Clarke, Kadlec, McNeil, Morrison, and Thacker, ‘Dora’. For other relevant work, see Commentale and Gasiorek; Levenson; and Scholes, *Paradox*.

7 For the influence of Nietzsche on Lawrence, see Milton; and for his influence on Lewis, see Meyers and Edwards. For the influence of Carpenter on Lawrence, see Delavenay; and for his influence on Woolf, see Gerrard, ‘Brown-Ness’. For the influence of Bergson on Woolf, see Gillies, 107-131; and for Lewis’s critical response to Bergson, see *TWM*.

The move away from the singularities of 'class' or 'gender' as primary conceptual and organizational categories, has resulted in an awareness of the subject positions – of race, gender, generation, institutional location, geopolitical locale, sexual orientation – that inhabit any claim to identity in the modern world. (2)

In *Journey*, Jameson reaches towards a similar recognition of the complex nature of identity when she reflects:

An infinite number of accidents – a love of going much into company or disliking it, having a sensual robust body or a sickly crippled one, being brought up a Catholic or Calvinist – decides the answer that the sensitized nerves of the writer ... make to his world. (JNI 199)

In the 1920s, however, the young Jameson had less of an objective distance on 'the accidents of birth' (3Ks 257); and she experienced something akin to Frantz Fanon's 'Manichean delirium' (183). As a northern nonconformist who had won one of only three annual county scholarships available from the North Riding and who chose to study English – the poor man's Classics – at a new university, Jameson may be regarded as in an analogous position to Fanon's native Algerian intellectual in his white mask. By an Arnoldian logic still very much in operation in the early twentieth century, Jameson and her fellow English students at the University of Leeds were intended as 'assistant missionaries' to convert 'every important capital of industrialism in the country' to the cause of 'culture' (Newbolt Report (1921), qtd. in Doyle 100), yet according to the same Arnoldian logic, as first-generation-educated northern nonconformists they were themselves considered, by definition, 'uncultured', just as under colonialism to be black was to be considered, by definition, 'uncivilised'. If this interpretation of Jameson's situation seems exaggerated, it is worth pausing for a moment to consider Virginia Woolf on the subject of Jameson's friend of later years, Winifred Holtby. Also from the north of England, Holtby came from a considerably wealthier and more socially prominent family than Jameson and unlike her had been a female pioneer at Oxford University, yet Woolf's catty observation that she 'learnt to read ... while minding the pigs' betrays a staggering sense of southern cultural superiority (as well as a degree of insecurity in the face of Holtby's northern Otherness)

(qtd. in Shaw, *Clear* 251).⁸ Little wonder, then, that Jameson saw herself as a ‘clever savage’ (JN1 250) or ‘lettered barbarian’ (JMHR 36).

To complicate matters further, growing up in Edwardian England at a moment of radical change and coming to maturity across the historical fissure of the Great War, Jameson also experienced other self-conflicting models of identity: as a woman working in the male-dominated sphere of culture; as a socialist with roots in a proudly individualist protestant tradition; as an atheist with roots in religious nonconformity; and as a Modern in whose mind ‘the Victorian habit persisted, like an old coat hung behind the door’ (NTLP 71–2). The tormenting sense of self-division that this complex situation produced is evoked again and again in Jameson’s writing, as when, for example, she describes her autobiographical persona, Hervey, in *That Was Yesterday*, as a ‘queer tortured double figure’ (360); or when she quotes as an epigraph to her novel, *Three Kingdoms* (1926), a passage from Kipling’s story, ‘A Centurion of the Thirtieth’, in which the father of a British-born Roman youth advises his son against divided loyalties: ‘You can drive two mules .. three ... will tear you in pieces’ (159); or when she describes a dream in which she is walking naked and alone between the walls that, on either side, shut her out, while a voice addresses her as ‘poor thrawn girl’, ‘thrawn’ being a northern dialect word meaning ‘twisted’ (JN1 240).

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha goes on to argue that what matters is less the particular sources of one’s identity than what one *does* with them:

What is theoretically innovative, and politically crucial, is the need to think beyond narratives of originary and initial subjectivities and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences. These ‘in-between’ spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood – singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation.(2)⁹

8 Jaffe gives similar examples of the chauvinistic condescension shown by Orage towards the female New-Zealander, Katherine Mansfield, and by that Englishman-by-adoption, T.S. Eliot, towards an American Jewish poet, Maxwell Bodenheim (103-4). In both these cases, the perpetrators also had their own insecurities to protect.

9 Birkett quotes the very same Bhabha passage in ‘Re-imagining’ (17). However, where she cites gender and knowledge of French culture as the decisive ‘domains of difference’ operative within Jameson’s ‘coming to self-knowledge’ in the context of a “national” consensus’ (17), I argue that in Jameson’s early

After a period during which Jameson's unitary literary identity was that of 'the allowed political woman' of the 1930s (Vance, 'Rise' 124), critics have become more alive to the innovative manner in which her work – both of that decade and beyond – articulates differences and explores the spaces 'in-between'. Writing of *Civil Journey* (1945), Wendy Gan laments that 'Jameson's example of bringing seemingly oppositional discourses into relation has been lost amidst critical categorisations that do her little justice' ('*Civil*' 215), while Phyllis Lassner argues that 'all her writing of the thirties and forties resounds with challenges to the specious simplicities of dualistic thinking' (89). Nattie Golubov has explored, more specifically, the way in which Jameson and her socialist-women collaborators, Rebecca West, Winifred Holtby and Naomi Mitchison, resist 'recent attempts to incorporate them' into the Auden camp of the literary canon of the 1930s, since they eschewed extremism and developed an 'ethical socialism' that involved 'both conflict and cooperation among groups of people with different, often conflicting interests and needs' (34, 50). Similarly, recognising Jameson's 'continuous interest in the politics of gender' and hence her right to the feminist reclamation she has so far been denied, Briganti is forced to conclude that her 'deviation from what Elaine Showalter has conceptualised as a "female continuum" ... suggests that such concept [sic] needs to be complicated, lest it become as hegemonic as that male tradition which feminist revisionist criticism has set out to expose' ('Stern' 72–4). As a final example, Jennifer Birkett's various studies of Jameson's novelistic style from the 1930s onwards show how she drew upon French literary tradition to develop 'an intermediate form between everyday language and the discourses of high modernism' ('Spectacle' 31).¹⁰

work a more heterogeneous combination of 'domains of difference' is articulated, with northern provincialism, socialism and gender being foremost amongst these.

10 See 'Beginning', 'Re-Imagining' and 'Spectacle'.

Re-Reading Jameson's Early Novels

The most recent evidence of critical awareness of the dialogic and hybrid nature of Jameson's work is the essay-collection mentioned at the beginning of this Introduction, *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. One of the declared aims of this collection is to show how Jameson's 'long writing career was energised by a rich tension, at every level, between opposing impulses' (9). While many of the essays realise this aim to insightful effect, there is still a tendency to underestimate the intellectual power and dialogic complexity of the early work.¹¹ Thus, when Ouditt finds Jameson's early texts lacking in 'the certainties that informed her intellectual and political activities in the 1930s', she condemns them for what she describes as their 'vacillation' (53, 68). Birkett and Briganti, too, have difficulty characterising the early novels. In their introductory survey of her work, they observe, somewhat confusingly, both that Jameson's name was associated with 'steamy novels of passion' during her early career and that contemporary reviewers responded to the intellectual energy of her early novels, yet they fail to explore what Jameson's novelistic intentions might have been in bringing together such different registers (3-5).¹² Furthermore, they display an almost tangible sense of relief when they arrive at *The Lovely Ship* (1927), the first volume of Jameson's *Triumph of Time* trilogy (completed in 1931), in which they locate the beginnings of the 1930s stage of her career with its adaptation of the chronicle form as 'a supple medium to reflect the embeddedness of human character in history' (4).

Birkett and Briganti's account of Jameson's life in the 1920s and 30s in their Introduction also offers another example of the manner in which the myths Jameson

11 Insightful essays on the 'opposing impulses' within Jameson's writing include Briganti's account of how she experiments with 'la simultanéité narrative' in *Mirror in Darkness* (85) and McLoughlin's analysis of *Europe to Let* as a dramatisation of the 'politico-linguistic confrontation' of opposing voices surrounding the Munich Pact (109). For an early attempt to address Jameson's use of intertextual dialogue in her first two novels, see Gerrard, 'Tempestuous'.

12 That Jameson was intending to write something other than straight-forward 'steamy novels of passion' is suggested by her response when, as an aspiring young author, she was offered E. M. Dell's *The Way of an Eagle* as a literary model – she threw the book straight out of the train window (JNI 110-11).

creates in her autobiographies have contributed to the misunderstanding and neglect of her early work. Despite Briganti's recognition that Jameson 'fostered a reductive view of her own impressive achievements', she and her co-author fall into the trap of accepting Jameson's account of the key influence of her second husband, Guy Chapman, on her literary style ('Mirroring' 72). According to the account in *No Time Like the Present* to which Birkett and Briganti refer, the young Jameson had 'no notion how to write' when she produced her early novels and only learnt how to do so once she had absorbed 'other values ... than those [she] had brought with [her]' from 'a person of naturally fine tastes' whom she 'began to know intimately' (italics added, *NTLP* 142-3). This 'person of naturally fine tastes' was Chapman, a figure who was attached to the outer edges of the Bloomsbury group and whose 'tastes' had been formed by the same inherited cultural privilege as theirs.¹³ Yet it is important to place Jameson's account in its biographical context, for its production at a time (1932-3) when she had suffered a breakdown and was feeling extremely isolated suggests that it is less an account of the facts than a manifestation of a moment of acute self-alienation (Clay 78). In fact, Jameson continued her intellectually impassioned intertextual dialogue with modernism throughout the 1920s – that is, well after she first met Chapman in 1924 – and not long after their first meeting she even began to include fictionalised versions of him as not entirely flattering representatives of the highbrow.¹⁴ Furthermore, Jameson's decision at the beginning of the 1930s to 'write coldly and shortly without emphasis or charm' does not need her undoubted emotional dependence on Chapman to explain it, for – as will emerge during the course of this thesis – it can be seen as a product of her aforementioned intertextual dialogue. During the

13 Chapman was the great-nephew of Dickens's publisher and a descendant of the famous eighteenth-century scientific instrument-maker, Jesse Ramsden; the great educationalist and feminist, Dorothea Beale was a family friend. He was educated at Westminster and then Oxford and became a member of the literary and artistic Saville Club where he rubbed shoulders with W. B. Yeats, Alec Ross (the brother of Oscar Wilde's friend and protector, Robert Ross), and the painter, William Orpen. He was also good friends with two members of the Bloomsbury Group, Desmond McCarthy and Bonamy Dobrée. For details, see Chapman, *Survivor*.

14 The fictionalised versions of Chapman that form part of Jameson's dialogue with English modernism in the 1920s are Dysart Ford in *Three Kingdoms* and Hugh Hervey in *The Voyage Home* and *A Richer Dust*.

course of that extended dialogue, Jameson engaged with Imagism's 'direct treatment of the thing' and with Marsden's 'rhetorical hygiene' (Clarke 9); with Wyndham Lewis's argument (in *Time and Western Man*) that writers should use a common language to convey a creative vision that is rational and concrete and, finally and conclusively, with the down-to-earth linguistic theories of the American pragmatist, William James.

Other less self-punishing remarks by Jameson suggest, alternatively, that the 'barbaric' values she brought with her to the cultural centre in the 1920s were her greatest literary asset. Thus, in the very process of criticising her early work for its 'barbarity', Jameson regrets that 'in civilising a barbarian the danger is that something, some vital energy, irreplaceable, will be enervated at the same time as the barbarism' (JNI 283) or, explaining her life-long empathy with exiles, she observes that they 'add a sharp taste to our dull island soup' and 'carry ideas and opinions across the barbed wire' of cultural difference (JNII 313).¹⁵ In this thesis it is argued that Jameson's outsider status as a provincial socialist and a woman, when combined with her early immersion in a northern-based avant-garde, gave her the gift of 'double vision', so that her relation to English metropolitan modernism during the 1920s became that of a 'spy in enemy country,' cutting across exclusionary boundaries (Jameson, *Company* 56). It is argued, in addition, that during this period Jameson did not wait around for a Bloomsberry-in-armour to help her develop a satisfactory literary style, but was already involved in her own complex and challenging literary project. Finding her head 'a very tunnel for echoes' and yet finding no literary model that spoke to the Other nature of her experience (NTLP 142), she drew on both experience and 'echoes' to develop her own consciously 'impure' and highly allusive style of writing in novels that offer 'sharp' dialogic engagements with the texts of more culturally dominant modernist contemporaries. Although admittedly 'awkward' in style (JNI 84), these novels are only unrewarding if we do not understand how to read them.

15 See also the conclusion to *Journey II*, in which Jameson laments: 'With both hands I destroyed myself, denaturing my senses, tearing out energies, desires, greeds ... I *tamed* myself. Why?' (315).

Intertextuality and Jameson

This thesis adopts a socially oriented – as opposed to a Kristevan – intertextual model to address the early novels, since for Jameson novel-writing is essentially a social activity in which meaning is negotiated between reader and author: ‘There is no such thing,’ she remarks in *Civil Journey*, ‘as a book ... existing apart from human terms of reference, since a man made it and a man receives it’ (55). As a study, primarily, of Jameson’s arguments and ideas (including her ideas on aesthetics), this thesis does not analyse her novelistic *style* in any detail. Nevertheless its readings of the early novels are informed by the work of such intertextual theorists as Bakhtin, Genette and Riffaterre as well as by notions of ‘intertextual revisioning’ developed within the field of postcolonial studies (Newman 3).¹⁶ Types of transposition used by Jameson include the most familiar forms of parody and pastiche. As in much postcolonial ‘revisioning’, she also rewrites the plots of novels in order to amplify the stories of marginal characters or to emphasize alternative historical possibilities. She uses, too, a version of what Riffaterre – in the context of poetry – has called ‘ungrammaticality’, that is, a ‘sign ... which expresses or reflects a ... modification of mimesis’, alerting the reader to a second level of ‘significance’ within the text (3). Riffaterre goes on to explain that ‘it is when the description is most precise that the departures from acceptable representation ... make the shift towards symbolism more conspicuous’ (6). With due consideration to the difference in genre, Riffaterre’s account of the two-level semiotic process involved in reading a poem can help explain the manner in which particular details – phrases, images and even small scenes – function within, and sometimes across, Jameson’s early novels. Such details include the image of being attached to a tether (an allusion to Orage’s post-1910 views on human agency); the motif of the lion and the unicorn (an allusion to Lawrence’s ‘The Crown’); the repeated collocation of ‘space’ and ‘time’ (an allusion to Lewis’s attack on Bergson’s ‘Time philosophy’); and the creation of a

16 For discussions of the use of intertextuality as a strategy for ‘writing back’ to the colonial centre in postcolonial literature, see Newman, Thieme and Tiffin. For two clear overviews of intertextual theory, see G. Allen, and Plottel and Charney. For an example of Bakhtinian practice, see Lodge.

‘mosaic’ of photographs of friends created by one Mrs. James (an allusion to William James’s theory of the ‘mosaic’ community). In the experience of the present reader, it was the gratuitousness of such details within their narrative context – their ‘departures from acceptable representation’ – as well as, in some cases, their insistent repetition, that first provided the key to a second, intertextual level of significance within these early novels. There are examples, too, of Genette’s metatextuality, that is, when a text takes up a relation of ‘commentary’ to its not-necessarily-cited intertext, for example when an argument between two characters comments on Woolf’s well-known essay, ‘Character in Fiction’ (Genette 4). It should be noted, also, that although Jameson’s English modernist intertexts are primarily literary or journalistic, they include significant cultural events such as the Second Post-Impressionist Exhibition and iconic cultural figures.¹⁷

But what exactly defines Jameson’s choice of English ‘modernist’ intertexts and what do they have in common? Amidst the recent wealth of revisionary work on ‘modernism’ and ‘modernisms’, it has become generally recognised that just before the Great War and during the early 1920s ‘modernism’ had not reached its subsequent reified status, but was a ‘muddle’ from which selected strands had yet to emerge and form a dominant ideology (Churchill 222).¹⁸ Recent revisionary work has also highlighted the degree to which English ‘modernism’ was a site of cultural contestation in which the claims of various groups were exaggerated for the purposes of self-promotion and the establishment and policing of cultural territory.¹⁹ A number of recent commentators have gone so far as to argue that ‘the

17 For an analysis of Jameson’s similar treatment of the iconic 1930s poet, W. H. Auden, see Birkett, ‘Fictional’. Birkett’s article was published in summer 2007; the paper that formed the basis for my essay, ‘Tempestuous’, (also published in 2007), in which I first analysed Jameson’s intertextual treatment of the iconic cultural figures, Orage and Pound, was delivered at a symposium on Jameson’s work held the previous autumn.

18 Raymond Williams’s lecture, ‘When Was Modernism?’ (1987), later published posthumously in *The Politics of Modernism* (1989), was an early and important contribution to this change in critical perceptions of ‘modernism’. For other useful contributions, see DiBattista and McDiarmid; Levenson; and Ardis, *Modernism*.

19 See, for example, Rainey’s contrast between the ‘aggressive tone’ and ‘tentative definitions’ that characterised Pound’s promotion of Imagism (*Institutions* 29–31); Gasiorek’s account of the means whereby ‘*Blast* sought to establish a brand name for itself as a particular *kind* of avant-garde within the cultural economy of an emergent modernism’ (14); and Levenson’s account of the ‘effectively contrived

Manichean habit' was a distinguishing feature of the period's response to a sense of crisis (Levenson ix), and that there was a tendency to talk in terms of 'binary oppositions – high/low, for instance, or old/new – which turn out, upon examination, to be far from simple and anything but clear' (Scholes, *Paradoxy* xi).²⁰ This thesis argues that these features of the making of modernism were ones of which Jameson, as an astute cultural critic and an outsider-insider, was already conscious even while that making was in progress. It is further argued that the English 'modernism(s)' with which she is in dialogue in her early novels include a range of polarised forms of aesthetic, political and philosophical 'purism'. Examples of these include the 'romantic' utopianism (and feminism) of Carpenter, the early Orage and Virginia Woolf (Chs. 3, 4 and 6) and, at the other extreme, the 'classical' anti-humanism and misogyny of T. E. Hulme, Ezra Pound and others (Chs. 3 and 4) or D. H. Lawrence's equally reactionary 'cult of the phallus' (Ch. 5). On a more specifically aesthetic level, they include, at one extreme, Pound and Marsden's anarcho-Nietzschean aesthetic of 'embodied form' (Ch. 3) and, at the other, Woolf's ethereally idealist modernist aesthetic (Ch. 6). Likewise, they include the opposing extremes of modernist interiority, on the one hand, and of the 'exterior' styles of Wyndham Lewis and Ernest Hemingway, on the other (Ch. 7). Scholes has recently argued that the promotion of 'simple binary oppositions ... often functioned to suppress or exclude a middle term' (*Paradoxy* xii); similarly Jameson, at the time, was concerned that such extremist purisms were working to exclude the experience of other social groups and other ways of thinking. In a later discussion of 'The Form of the Novel', she would argue that since 'life ... is so full of impurities', 'the pure novelist, intent on easing the bulges out ..., is forced to exclude too much' (*Writer's* 61).

rhetoric' of tradition that T. S. Eliot employed after the war as he moved to distance himself from Pound's self-promotion as a subversive radical (217).

20 See also Susan Stanford Friedman's argument that 'the oppositional meanings of modern/modernity/modernisms point to the contradictory dialogic running through the historical and expressive formations of the phenomena to which the terms allude' ('Definitional' 510).

Jameson and Pragmatism

The way of thinking that can increasingly be seen to fertilise the “‘in-between” spaces’ that Jameson’s ‘articulation of [English modernist] cultural differences’ produces is the Pragmatism of the American philosopher and psychologist, William James (Bhabha 2).²¹ Hence the answer to Ann Ardis’s question quoted at the opening of this Introduction would seem in Jameson’s case to be that her ‘*other* aesthetic and political agenda’ is a pragmatic one and hence this thesis might more aptly be entitled ‘A Pragmatist in Dialogue with English modernism’.²² Indeed in his book, *Pragmatism* (1907), James himself observes a tendency to polarisation within contemporary intellectual life between ‘authoritarians and anarchists ... purists ... and realists classics and romantics’ and recommends his philosophy as a ‘mediator’ between such extremes (3, 105).²³ Jameson’s progressively more detailed intertextual explorations of James’s philosophy in her second novel, *The Happy Highways* (1920), and her eighth, *The Voyage Home* (1930), are discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 7 respectively. However, given the detailed knowledge of his thought that emerges in these later novels, it is likely that even her very first novel, *The Pot Boils* (1919), is

21 For the purposes of this thesis, James’s Pragmatism is taken to include his empirical psychology with which it is continuous.

22 Jameson’s Pragmatism – like her early anarchism – was socialist. For links between Jamesian Pragmatism and Proudhon’s socialist variety of anarchism, see Kadlec, 24. It is worth noting, too, that James, like Jameson, was a lapsed nonconformist. For the strong links between Victorian nonconformity and various secular forms of Edwardian radicalism, see Samuel, 295–312. Adding to our understanding of the true cultural complexity of modernism(s), increasing numbers of critics have also noted the influence of James’s philosophy on certain ‘radical’ modernists. For its influence on American modernists, see Lentricchia, Levin and, in particular, Kadlec on Pound’s ‘pragmatic aesthetics’ (80). Although there is undoubtedly more work to be done on James’s influence on English modernists, Jeff Wallace has noted his influence on Lawrence, and Paul Edwards has recognized the deep attraction that certain aspects of his philosophy had for Lewis (despite Lewis’s vociferous disagreement with others). More surprisingly, perhaps, in ‘Afterword’, Melba Cuddy-Keane offers some fascinating insights into the possible influence of James’s thought on the writing of Virginia Woolf.

23 James’s notion of the ‘tender-minded’ idealist versus the ‘tough-minded’ materialist, in particular, permeates Jameson’s early fiction and has parallels with the polarities of ‘romantic’ and ‘classical’ modernism, although the two sets of opposites are not synonymous. In this thesis, the term ‘materialism’ is taken to comprehend economic, cultural and biological (including psychological) varieties of mechanism, the particular variety under discussion being specified where necessary. ‘Idealism’, a trickier and more fluid term, is used to refer *either* to the religious or humanistic belief that the world is ‘simple, clean and noble’ *or*, more often, to the belief in an equivalent neo-platonic realm to which humanity can aspire (James, *Pragmatism* 8). When applied to aesthetics, it refers to the belief that art offers a window onto the latter world.

influenced by James's 'pragmatic method', that is, by the requirement to test ideas against our experience of reality (and vice versa). In *Pragmatism*, James twice describes the tendency of experience to 'boil over' or 'boil away from' our notions of truth and 'mak[e] us correct our present formulas', observing on the second occasion how at 'a certain stage of youth' we are particularly prone to believe we can discover 'the truth' about life (86, 93). The subject of *The Pot Boils* is just such a stage of youth, which suggests that there may be a conscious allusion to James's 'boiling' analogy in the novel's irreverent title. The additional words 'and the Scum Rises' in the original version of that title, in particular, suggests the uncomfortable material realities that arise to threaten the idealism of youth (JNI 99).

Pragmatism, James tells us in his eponymous text, is both a 'method' and a 'theory of truth' (22). The 'pragmatic method' informs the manner in which, in Jameson's early novels, modernist ideas (in the form of intertexts) are set in dialogue with fictionalised versions of her own experience at the same time as they are set in dialogue with one another. According to James's pragmatist 'theory of truth', 'our thoughts become true in proportion as they successfully exert their go-between function' between our previous ideas and new experience that challenges those ideas (*Pragmatism* 26). Truth, therefore, is plural, provisional, in-the-making and, since our actions contribute to the creation of truth, it pays us to 'believe ... in the ideal as an ultimate, if not as an origin' (*Pragmatism* 114). One name James gives to the latter idea is the 'will to believe'.²⁴ Because of its manner of relating ideas to (fictionalised) experience, Jameson's dialogic method invites readers to engage in this on-going process of truth-making by coming to their own provisional conclusions, and although at times one viewpoint is emphasized more than another in these early novels, a sense of provisionality and uncertainty always remains (*The Pitiful Wife* being the exception that proves this particular rule).²⁵ At the same time, when examined diachronically, we can also see the intertextual novels of the 1920s – in James's terms – as a

24 See James's eponymous essay.

25 Compare Birkett's observation that Jameson's later writing 'call[s] the reader into the role not of passive consumer but active collaborator in the making of meaning' ('Beginning' 10).

series of ‘turning-places, where [Jameson] seem[s] to make [herself] and grow’ (*Pragmatism* 111).

The ‘spurts and sallies’ of Jameson’s intellectual journey through the 1920s recalls a favourite passage of hers from C. E. Montague’s *Right Off the Map* (1927), which can be read as an allegory of Pragmatism.²⁶ In this passage the army of an imaginary republic called Ria marches up a trackless valley without an adequate map and each soldier has repeatedly to adjust his direction in order to negotiate the rubble with which the valley is strewn.²⁷ The individual trajectory of each soldier in this account – zigzagging to and fro across the valley floor yet moving in a single overall direction – may be compared to the intellectual path plotted by Jameson in her intertextual novels of the 1920s as she zigzags between such opposing polarities as utopianism and reaction; subjectivity and objectivity; feminism and misogyny; idealism and materialism; Self and Other. Whilst in individual texts she may tend towards one side or the other of the issues being considered, taken as a whole the novels reveal the general direction of her journey to be towards an increasingly Jamesian philosophy and psychology. By the end of the 1920s this philosophy includes not only a belief in the value of the pragmatic method, but also an interpretation of consciousness and experience as consisting of a series of self-coalescent fragments loosely connected by memory, and of society, likewise, as a series of smaller fragments (including individual selves) loosely connected to one another in a wide variety of ways. Finally, it includes a ‘will to believe’ in the potential for ever-increasing amounts of unity in the world and in the value of her own role as thinker and writer in contributing both to that unity and

26 For Jameson’s quotation of this passage (which extends for several pages) as an example of good contemporary story-telling, see GN, 25–31.

27 The trope of the unreliable or lost path – for example, a cowpath in the woods or a mountain pass in a blizzard – is a favourite one with James (*Pragmatism* 78; *Will* 31). Significantly, the mountain-pass example comes in a quotation from the nonconformist Fitz James Stephen and behind Stephen can be glimpsed that invaluable guide for all nonconformists, *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, a text that is echoed time and again in Jameson’s own writing. Pragmatism can thus be seen as a way of dealing with modernity as a secular pilgrim’s progress or ‘civil journey’ in which there is no map – in the form of God’s Word – to teach us the way. Significantly, the titles of several of Jameson’s books contain allusions to a path or journey, for example, *The Happy Highways*, *None Turn Back*, *Civil Journey*, *The Road to the Monument*, *Before the Crossing* and, of course, *Journey from the North*.

to the clarity of perception needed to achieve it. The following brief summary of each chapter of this thesis offers a slightly more detailed account of this intellectual trajectory and of some of the twists and turns taken along the way. It also highlights the specificity of Jameson's experience both as a woman and as a cultural outsider-insider; her strong awareness of the issue of violence; and her search as a writer and a socialist for stylistic tools with which to give accessible and honest expression to modernity in a manner that in some way contributes to the betterment of society.

The first chapter fills in the background of Jameson's crucial formative years, including the already-divided nature of her experience as a child growing up in the backward-looking northern seaport of Whitby and the profound impact of her two-stage journey into metropolitan modernism via the provincial modernism of Leeds University. Chapter 2 analyses the 'new age' M.A. thesis on modern European drama that Jameson wrote as a radical young postgraduate in London immediately before the Great War. It argues that Jameson's study of the ground-breaking modernism of late nineteenth century and early twentieth century European drama raised her awareness both of social revolt and of stylistic experiments which probed the unconscious realm and challenged contemporary perceptions of reality. The chapter's main focus, however, is on mining Jameson's thesis for evidence of early modernist critical and theoretical sources associated with the *New Age*, for these were some of the chief influences on her intellectual development at this stage and they would be among the first intertexts that she would criticise once she began her fictional dialogue with English modernism during the Great War. The chapter notes how the contradictory nature of the textual sources used in Jameson's thesis reflects a 'reconciling turn of mind' that had been characteristic of the Edwardian period but that was now at breaking point. Finally, the chapter also notes that whilst the idealistic and politically radical young Jameson was still just about able to reconcile the extremes of anarchism and authoritarianism, mystical utopianism and the Nietzschean Will in her

thesis, even at this early stage she drew the line at the political quietism of the ‘neo-Classical’ symbolist drama promoted in the post-1910 *New Age*.

The remainder of the thesis offers a chronological account of Jameson’s on-going intertextual dialogue with English modernism(s) in the years immediately following the Great War and up to 1931, as she began to question not only her own early extremism but also the post-war cultural scene in which she now found herself. The pragmatic theme of experience is foregrounded in the introduction to each chapter which brings the reader up-to-date with key developments in Jameson’s life that fed into her fiction. The subject of both Chapters 3 and 4 is Jameson’s early re-evaluation of ‘the mad hopes, the idealism, the messianic dream’ of her student years in each of her first two novels, *The Pot Boils* (1919) and *The Happy Highways* (1920) respectively (JN1 115). Chapter 3 considers Jameson’s first semi-autobiographical account of the disillusioning experience of radical northern students attempting to make their mark on the metropolis in *The Pot Boils*. It argues that the novel’s two main male characters represent opposing extremes within the early modernist movement – namely a ‘soft’ ‘romantic’ tendency towards neo-platonic idealism, theory and egalitarianism, on the one hand, and a ‘hard’ ‘classical’ tendency towards anti-foundationalism, praxis and a Nietzschean Will-to-Power, on the other – and that, towards the end of the novel, a socialist version of the political and aesthetic pragmatism of H. G. Wells is put forward as a more modestly achievable aspiration than either of these modernist messianisms.²⁸ It reads the story of the main female character as a semi-autobiographical version of Jameson’s own struggle with, and eventual liberation from, the extreme misogyny of the post-1910 *New Age* and of her new-found solidarity with women from all walks of life.

Chapter 4 focuses on *The Happy Highways*, Jameson’s second, more elegaic re-evaluation of her life as a student in pre-war London. The chapter argues that the ‘classical’ anti-

28 Wells’s admiration for James’s *Pragmatism* is reflected in his use of a quotation from it as an epigraph to *The New Machiavelli* (1911).

humanism of T.E. Hulme and others is briefly suggested at the opening of the novel by the draconian northern society in which the student characters are brought up. The ‘romantic’ anarcho-socialist idealism – a combination of Carpenter and Marsden – which the students adopt once they have escaped to pre-war London is seen as a swing to the opposite extreme and this extreme is then challenged, in turn, by a fictional version of Jameson’s own psychological and material experience: by the ‘freewoman’ character’s bewildered discovery of the intransigence of sexual conditioning; by the Freudian return of the narrator’s repressed childhood experience of brutality; and by the human capacity for brutality revealed by the Great War. The novel ends with the narrator’s fragile affirmation of a Jamesian ‘will to believe’ in the value of human life and socialist endeavour despite the evidence to the contrary. Chapter 4 also highlights the theme of aesthetics in *The Happy Highways*. It analyses the novel’s critique of the elitist experimentalism and the all-encompassing subjectivity characterising certain forms of early modernist art and explores its moves towards a more socially-inclusive aesthetic within the context of modernity.

Chapters 5 and 6 are complementary. Each chapter considers Jameson’s intertextual dialogue with the work of a single author – D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf respectively – within the context of the inter-war cultural conflict that Woolf later dubbed the ‘Battle of the Brows’ (‘Middlebrow’ 176). Chapter 5 traces the socio-cultural connections between Jameson and Lawrence and notes the ambivalent attitude of the former towards the work of the latter. It enumerates the elements within Lawrence’s work that Jameson admired: his attack on English idealism; his pluralist willingness to engage with difference; his early feminism; and his experiments with the gothic. It then sets against this admiration her disquiet at signs of an extremist misogyny and proto-fascism emerging within Lawrence’s writing from around 1915–18. *The Clash* is read as an unresolved intertextual dialogue between Jameson’s own female sexual experience and Lawrence’s belief in the value of opening up to the Other or what Sargent and Watson have termed his ‘ethics of alterity’ (413). Although this belief is seen as admirable as it informs Lawrence’s

best practice, it is exposed as potentially dangerous in his most recent primitivist writing, where, in the context of heterosexual relationships, it is reinterpreted as a unidirectional duty of subservience by the woman to the man. Within the context of this dialogue, English idealism is seen to have its advantages after all, since it offers women at least some limited protection against men's (material) sexual aggression. *The Pitiful Wife* is read as a more straightforwardly admiring engagement with Lawrence's experimental gothic. This gothic is interpreted as drawing, firstly, on the psychological gothic of the Brontë sisters and, secondly, on Ruskin's 'impure' architectural gothic, to evoke darkness and difference both within and outside the Self (Chaudhuri 205). This time, it is argued, Jameson's reading of Lawrence's 'ethics' is gender-neutral. On a psychological level, she finds that his gothic representation of darkness and difference *within* the Self reflects her own experience of emotional fracture at this stage in her personal life and her new recognition that the capacity for violence resides not only in the male, but also in her own female Self. On a socio-cultural level, too, it is argued that as an outsider-insider within the metropolitan cultural scene, Jameson is attracted to Lawrence's 'imperfect' gothic style – which allows space for difference – in preference to the exclusionary aesthetic purism of Bloomsbury to which *The Pitiful Wife* is, by implication, a response.

Chapter 6 reads the first two-thirds of *Three Kingdoms* (1926) as a polemical reply to both the aesthetic and the social and political idealisms of Virginia Woolf's famous essay, 'Character in Fiction' (1924), in which Jameson revises Woolf's novel, *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925) along materialist lines. Writing back to Woolf's aesthetic idealism, a carnivalesque celebration of the material grotesque and experiments with traces of the sub-genre of persecutory gothic take the place of *Mrs. Dalloway*'s stylistic evocation of the ethereal 'flight of the mind'. Writing back to Woolf's social and political idealism, Jameson ironically reinterprets her polemical assertion of modernist rupture in 'Character in Fiction' as referring to the rise of a new breed of 'middle-brow' materialists that challenges the cultural dominance of the novel's Bloomsbury-like 'high-brow' elite. In so doing, she revises the

fates of both *Mrs. Dalloway*'s marginalised meritocrats, Miss Kilman and Septimus Warren-Smith, in *her* meritocratic heroine's successful assault on the cultural centre. However, this counter-cultural notion of rupture is also problematised towards the end of the novel when her heroine becomes aware that her struggle for power has produced its own marginalised victims and makes a pragmatic attempt to negotiate a path that will take into consideration *all* society's ghostly Others.

Chapter 7 interprets Jameson's first trilogy, *The Triumph of Time* (1927-31) as a definitive 'voyage home' from her dialogue with English modernism, driven both by the impact of Wyndham Lewis's notorious attack on modernism in *Time and Western Man* (1927) and by the continuing influence of William James.²⁹ A preliminary discussion of some critical writing from this period reveals Jameson once again to be negotiating between extremes. On the one hand, she seconds Lewis's call for a 'revolutionary' literary traditionalism which combines analytical detachment with a depiction of human agency and community; on the other, she dissociates herself from his rejection of modernist representations of interiority and the flux of time as innately passive and politically defeatist. Seeking a literary method that negotiates the space between these two approaches, in the second and third volumes of her trilogy she develops a literary version of William James's radical empiricism, which treats the contents of the mind as objectively as it does the external world; which allows a limited scope for human agency; and which has a notion of community 'growing not integrally but piecemeal' (*Pragmatism*, 112). Lewis's 'objective' and modernism's 'subjective' extremes are represented in *The Voyage Home* (1930) and *A Richer Dust* (1931) by the contrasting personalities of the trilogy's first-generation couple, Mary and Hugh Hervey, both of whom are found wanting. In *The Voyage Home*, hope for the future is represented by the self-aware pragmatism of two of the couple's children and by the wife of a sea-

29 Jameson wrote one final 'brilliant and neglected' intertextual response to English modernism, the novella *A Day Off* (1933), which, sadly, lies outside the chronological parameters of this thesis (Birkett, 'Beginning' 8). In it, she re-visions both Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* (a second time) and the Kreisler sub-plot in Wyndham Lewis's *Tarr* (1918), taking as her subject the thoughts and feelings of an elderly and marginalised working-class woman.

captain, Mrs. James, who models William James's 'mosaic' community in her relationships with others as she criss-crosses the seas. However, in the trilogy's final volume, Jameson's own 'will to believe' in a Jamesian solution falters as she momentarily 'los[es] all interest and belief in writing' in the face of the seemingly overwhelming challenges of modernity (NTLP 144).

Conclusion

The above chapter summaries suggest how Jameson used her intertextual fiction during the course of the 1920s to work through the intellectual problems raised by her initial immersion in early modernism and by her observations of the contemporary cultural scene; how her thinking was increasingly influenced by her reading of William James; and how she returned again and again to the need to take the plural nature of reality – both idealism and materialism, Self and Other, conjunctions and disjunctions – into account. A central irony regarding her intertextual method remains to be commented upon, however: while used by Jameson to critique the exclusionary nature of much English modernist fiction, the method was itself extremely narrow in the range of its appeal. Although a detailed study of the reception of Jameson's early novels has been beyond the scope of this thesis, an admittedly brief search of contemporary book reviews has not revealed a single one in which the intertextual dimension of her early fiction is observed.³⁰ On the other hand, a number of reviewers appear to sense that the novels are aimed at (or require) a narrowly specialist audience.³¹ Thus, the anonymous reviewer of *The Pot Boils* for *Punch* complains that although 'the tale is hardly likely to gain universal popularity, ... certain persons, notably very young Socialists and experts in Labour journalism, may find it of absorbing interest' (Anon. 151). Reviewing *The Happy Highways* for the *TLS*, William Orlo also seems to get close to the truth when he observes sardonically, 'Is Mr. Jameson (sic) thinking of the

30 The reviewer of *The Clash* for the *Saturday Review* notes echoes from Lawrence and from *Wuthering Heights*, but makes no reference to the dialogic manner in which such echoes are being used.

31 Compare Birkett's view that 'at this stage, Jameson was speaking to a small audience of her peers', although Birkett does not go on to explore the implications of this idea ('Spectacle' 27).

reader's benefit at all? We see no sign of it' (599). Indeed at times the intertextual novels of the 1920s seem to function as a journal disguised as marketable fiction, in which Jameson – as youthful outsider-insider, frustrated literary critic and writer-in-forma-tion – encodes her private responses to emerging literary and cultural trends.

Despite the down-beat final volume of *The Triumph of Time* and her momentary experience of 'accidie' as a writer in late 1930 (*JNI* 283), Jameson entered the new decade not only with a Jamesian 'will to believe' that 'another and more complex and civilised order' – taking into account the needs of all society's Others – '[wa]s possible', but also with a Lewis-inspired faith that 'a novelist [wa]s more important than a politician' when it came to achieving that order (*Soul* 12–13; *CJ* 75). If she were to play her part in this project, however, Jameson had to re-invent herself as a novelist with a broader appeal. Jennifer Birkett, in particular, has brilliantly demonstrated how – from the mid-1930s onwards – French modernism offered her 'techniques for drawing readers into the word-web that reconstructs the landscape of collective experience' ('Spectacle' 31), while Chiara Briganti has suggested that she drew on continental literary experiments which – in their attempt to connect the aesthetic realm to the contemporary historical world – 'did not receive the stamp of approval of [English] high modernism' ('Mirroring' 85). Yet the conceptual understanding that put these techniques to work was born out of Jameson's dialogue with English modernism during the previous decade – as, too, (pace Birkett and Briganti) were some of those techniques themselves.

Chapter 1

Whitby, Leeds, London: Jameson's Journey into Modernism

Introduction

This chapter traces the three stages of Jameson's biographical journey from Whitby, the small seaport where she was born in 1891, via the new University of Leeds (1909–12) to the cultural centre of pre-war London (1912–14). It is the kind of educational journey that would have been extremely unusual for a man from her economic and geographic background even a quarter of a century earlier and which was still rare for a woman. It is not, therefore, surprising that Jameson and those who, like her, were benefitting from university extension should have felt that they were part of a new *zeitgeist* and that anything was possible. Detailed information regarding the (often contradictory) avant-garde ideas adopted by the young Jameson and her student friends is essential for an understanding of precisely what she was reacting *against* when she began her literary dialogue with 'modernism' during the Great War.

This chapter is divided into three sections based on the three locations in which Jameson spent her formative years. It begins with her childhood in Whitby and her early experience both of being torn between jurisdictions and of being outside established boundaries altogether – that is, of not belonging. The second section looks at Jameson's experience of freedom and belonging at the egalitarian new University of Leeds, in which established boundaries were everywhere being broken down. Drawing on contributions to the university's student journal, the *Gryphon*, with which she was involved, this section looks at Jameson's encounter with a socialist variety of feminism and two male-dominated varieties of socialism – the down-to-earth democratic socialism of her university tutors and the mystical Nietzschean-socialism emanating from Alfred Orage's Leeds Arts Club and his journal, the *New Age*. The latter utopian variety of socialism is also viewed as an early form

of modernism since its exponents believed that radical social transformation would only come about through spiritual change and that the Arts were best placed to effect that change. This section argues that although she was exposed to both varieties of socialism, Jameson was more in sympathy with the former democratic variety while at Leeds, and that – having completed her journey into modernism in the London of 1912–14 – it would be to this variety that she would return.

The final section of this chapter explores Jameson's experience as an M.A. student in pre-war London. It looks briefly at the cultural shift from 'romantic' to 'classical' modernism that was occurring at around this time, before going on to focus on Jameson's own modernist position. Abandoning the economically focused democratic-socialism that she had espoused at Leeds, it is argued, Jameson now became a fully committed member of a small but exclusive Nietzschean-socialist group. This group greatly admired Orage's *New Age* (to which its members contributed), sharing the journal's emphasis on the spiritual and psychological as opposed to the material condition of Man. However, it was more in sympathy with the *New Age*'s early 'romantic' utopianism than with its recent move towards an anti-progressive 'classicism'. Finally, this section ends by examining Jameson's involvement, from the spring of 1914 onwards, with Dora Marsden's anarcho-modernist journal, the *Egoist*, and by clarifying crucial differences between Marsden's egoistic form of anarchism and the anarchistic Nietzschean-socialism to which Jameson and her friends subscribed. Throughout this chapter particular attention is drawn to the distinctive nature of Jameson's experience as a woman with intellectual aspirations that were still exceptional for the period.

A Divided Childhood.

I, thought Andrew, am stifling in this icy cold, between two worlds. (Jameson, *Moon* 319)

Jameson's experience of cultural conflict reaches back into pre-consciousness as she records a family dispute over the appropriate christening place for herself as a baby: the

beautiful old Anglican church, St. Mary's, Whitby, to which her family had traditionally belonged, or the recently built Congregational chapel her mother had joined in a gesture of revolt. The row was symbolic of a family in social decline, just on the 'right' side of the cusp between middle and lower-middle classes.¹ Her novel *The Moon is Making* (1937) draws attention to the manner in which social divisions in her small native town were etched into the landscape, the River Esk dividing the lower-class district of the East Cliff (Under Wik) from the more upper-class district of the West Cliff (Over Wik). These divisions were mirrored within Jameson's own family. Her mother, Hannah Margaret Gallilee, was the daughter of a *rentier* and shipowner, George Galilee, who had sold out at the bottom of the market. A Tory gentleman who 'believed with cold ferocity that Lloyd George should be hanged and the lower classes kept in their place', Galilee was also 'bookish and extremely fastidious' (JNI 21). Hannah, who had had the education of a gentlewoman, could play the piano, spoke with a standard English accent and had an 'unconscious arrogance' which was an 'echo' of her father's strong sense of social superiority (JNI 34). Jameson's father, Captain William Jameson, on the other hand, had been disadvantaged by his family's sudden descent into poverty at the hands of a fraudulent solicitor. Sent to sea as an apprentice at the age of thirteen, he was not an educated man, although – 'schooled in bitter hardship and cruelty' – he became a highly skilled seaman (JNI 34). The marriage was not helped by Captain Jameson's long months away at sea, but Jameson accounted for the 'abyss' between her parents primarily in social terms: her mother had married 'a man inferior to her in breeding', a dialect speaker whose manners 'were rough or too familiar' (JNI 33–4).

The split in her parents' marriage produced the kind of fight for ownership of the children that Jameson was later to greet with a sense of familiarity in Strindberg's play *The Father* (MDE 41ff.). As in Strindberg's play, the father's claims were defeated almost from

1 According to John Gay, 'To announce you were joining the Church of England was often regarded as a proclamation of success. Conversely a person of high social standing would hardly ever throw in his lot with the chapel folk – to do so would incur loss of status' (107).

the start. In the case of the Jameson family, the balance of power was affected not so much by blood-line as by both class and tenure, Hannah's role as holder of the family fort during her husband's long absences giving her a degree of autonomy unusual for the period. 'It seemed that a nerve led directly from my young mind to hers', Jameson writes of her relationship with her mother in *Journey*, and this nerve lived on into adulthood, so that it is her mother's voice (and that of her maternal grandfather) that Jameson later feels deflecting her own voice and 'dictat[ing] [her] first choices' (JNI 20, 32). Yet Jameson's literary portraits of her mother incorporate 'a sustained critical analysis of [her] power and its abuse', while those of her father are infused with a covert empathy (Birkett, 'Doubly' 85).

One consequence of her parents' marital situation and indeed of the social patterns within her local community was Jameson's life-long ambivalence towards gender issues. Although she was aware 'and with what helpless pity, that [her mother's life] had disappointed her', she also recognized that her father was equally frustrated, having 'a streak of fantasy that in other circumstances might have changed his life' (JNI 32, 35). When Jameson later turned to 'the traditionally male discourses of politics and writing', her role models for this choice were as much female as male (Birkett, 'Doubly' 73): the more educated, intellectually critical mother; the aunt who was a deacon in the Congregational Church; and even the legendary Whitby fishwife, Fish Jane, whose political influence was such that she was courted by the Tory candidate on election day. Conversely, it is as often men as women who are portrayed as disempowered and inhabiting the social margins in Jameson's work. Indeed, in an inversion of a key trope of French feminism, it is her mother whom Jameson portrays as the law-giver, the arbiter of 'Justice', the guardian of the sacred flame of logocentrism (of which she was yet a victim), while it is with the banished father (not allowed to set foot in the mother's side of the house) that Jameson associates natural desire, creativity and the socially disruptive forces of the unconscious (JNI 24). As featured in *Journey*, in particular, Captain William Jameson could serve as an anachronistic

figure for *l'écriture féminine*. A dreamer whose domain as a sea-captain is the open waves (in contrast to the walled-in domain of the mother's 'show house'), he is plural – 'with ... so many [selves] in one lean hard weathered body' – and is associated with poetry and experimentalism as manifested in the 'millions and millions of [semi-literate] words' in which over a life time he recorded his own 'eccentric' view of the world (*JNI* 258; *JNII* 123, 127–8). He is also associated with 'the underworld' of the author's own unconscious (*JNI* 123).

A second consequence of Jameson's upbringing by her mother was a heightened awareness of the cruelty – whether mental or physical – involved in the policing of social boundaries. Although Jameson tells us that 'in those days it was the custom to thrash children', all of the numerous accounts of child abuse in her writing suggest that the chastisements she received as a child went well beyond the social norm, being the product both of a nonconformist brand of self-righteousness and of 'an unconscious cruelty nourished by boredom' (*JNI* 23; *Moon* 87).² In *Journey*, the personal becomes political as Jameson reaches for a vocabulary associated with military oppression in her attempts to convey this childhood experience. '*I shall thrash you when we get home*' has 'the ring of a death sentence' (*JNI* 23). The pupil of her mother's eye seems 'to send out a flash of light, like the discharge from a gun' (*JNI* 23). The cowering child is 'a desperate animal behind bars' who 'does not think of himself as a child and of his elders as adults; he thinks in terms of rulers and ruled, helpless and powerful. Very much ... as the inhabitants of an occupied country feel towards an occupier' (*JNI* 23, 31). Furthermore, the abused Jameson understands the intimate knowledge the oppressed has of her oppressor, her unique access to the 'naked quivering little creature behind the eyes of the person' who inflicts pain (*JNI* 36). To this childhood experience, Jameson suggests, may be attributed her early grasp of the threat of Fascism. 'If I looked closely enough, I might see that what made me loath

2 For accounts of child-abuse in Jameson's work, see, for example, *PB*, 96–7; *PW*, 26–8; *TWY*, 9, 50, 91–2; *JNI*, 87.

Fascism was only ... a mute rebellion against my violently feared and loved mother', Jameson reluctantly admits in *Journey*, while the English fascism she imagines in her dystopia, *In the Second Year* (1936), is characterized by 'streaks of a Methodist virtue' – not her mother's congregationalism but religious nonconformity nonetheless (JNI 295, 335). It may be as a consequence of her early experience of acute physical pain that Jameson is never tempted as a writer to underestimate the materiality of human existence, refusing to believe that 'mental agony is as intolerable as physical pain' (JNI 136).

Finally, Jameson's sense of inhabiting a space beyond social boundaries may have been derived, in part, from the nonconformist tradition in which she was raised. This tradition refused to recognize all worldly jurisdictions, relying instead on private conscience and the at-times-opaque Word of God. Its refusal is epitomized by the civil protest of Whitby's Unitarian minister, Haydn Williams, who was set up as a moral exemplar for the young Jameson children. When the town council decided to enclose the Common in order to make it into a more exclusively bourgeois attraction, Williams repeatedly led a crowd to tear down the railings intended to shut out undesirables (NTLP 28). Jameson would later devote *The Moon is Making* to this incident. In this novel, her account of the spiritual struggle of Williams's persona, Handel Wikker, corresponds closely to the critic Vincent Newey's account of the workings of the nonconformist conscience. Like Newey's Puritan, 'virtually rootless and always struggling' in the absence of validation from a terrestrial community whose authority he refuses to recognise, Wikker looks to the practice of occasional meditation to 'verify his calling' (Newey 216). According to Newey, both occasional meditation and spiritual autobiography are part of an unconscious process of self-authorisation that must be constantly renewed as the pilgrim swings from a belief in his own spiritual belonging or election to self-doubt and the fear of exclusion. This process of self-authorisation started early for Jameson when she dreamt of pursuing a secular literary calling and thus of 'turn[ing] out different from anyone else in the town' (*Moon* 116). Perpetually oscillating between an energizing 'faith in the singularity of [her] existence

and power of perception' (Newey 215) and a disabling sense of her own 'freakishness' (JNI 45), in the numerous autobiographical and semi-autobiographical writings of her long career Jameson would continually seek to chart and understand her secular pilgrim's progress through an alien landscape in which she 'never felt separated from an exile by more than a thin membrane' (JNI 323).³

As a first step to the achievement of her ambitions, in September 1908 Jameson moved to the Municipal School in Scarborough with a view to winning a County Scholarship to university. Thus began a rare period, lasting until her marriage in the summer of 1913, during which she felt a more or less complete sense of belonging, pursuing a life of intellectual independence among other northerners and within an atmosphere of (relative) sexual equality: in class 5b 'no one looked on [Jameson] as a freak' (JNI 49). For the first time, too, she encountered intellectual modernity in the form of the Harland brothers, Oswald and Sydney, both of whom would become life-long friends. Sydney, in particular, had become a socialist after reading Robert Blatchford's *Merrie England* (1894) and H. G. Wells's *This Misery of Boots* (1907) and was in touch with metropolitan ideas through his habit of reading every journal that entered the Reading Room of the Scarborough Mechanics Institute. A brilliant and original thinker, he would go on to become a Fellow of the Royal Society and 'the foremost geneticist in the British Empire', according to his friend, the renowned geneticist J. B. S. Haldane, travelling the globe in search of botanical specimens and actively defying the colour bar in Johannesburg, the Caribbean and South America (Harland, *Nine* 105). Although Harland's socialism, atheism, anarchism and belief in free love were 'common cant enough among the ragtag and bobtail of the advanced' of the metropolis (HH 22), they came as a complete revelation to the 'raw, naively ignorant' young Jameson (JNI 49). As a consequence of her friendship with both the Harland brothers Jameson shook off the Congregationalist faith of her childhood and became a

3 See Joannou for an interpretation of *Journey* as a conversion narrative in which 'the writer ... describes a life of self-sacrifice and service to others, *through which she acquires the confidence and the authority* to represent her aspirations and achievements in writing' (italics added, 154).

socialist, so that when she came to take her next step towards the fulfilment of her ambitions, entering the new University of Leeds on one of the coveted county scholarships, she was well prepared to engage with the radicalism she would encounter there.

Leeds and Social Transformation: 1909–1912.

The turbulent spirit of the democratic Dionysus. (Orage, 'Infant' 89)

In the Leeds of 1909 to 1912, Jameson lived 'in another world and age' from that of the turn-of-the-century Oxford described in Compton MacKenzie's autobiographical novel, *Sinister Street* (JNI 51). On a national and even an international level, these were years of rapid social and cultural upheaval. The death of King Edward VII – an event often associated with the birth of modernism – occurred during Jameson's first year. In Alfred Orage's Leeds Arts Club, the city possessed its own home-grown source of modernism, 'one of the most interesting sites of radical experimental art outside of London', while its new university was also a vital centre of change, playing its part in a nationwide process of university extension (Steele 1). Intended as an Arnoldian strategy for 'the control and dissemination of a national identity', this process clearly underwent a sea change on its journey up north, with those involved on the ground in Leeds and other northern metropolitan centres manifesting a range of left-leaning attitudes from an enlightened New Liberalism to a potentially more subversive involvement in the local Labour movement (Dodd 4). Radicalism was in the air and both teachers and students felt themselves to be active participants in an important moment of political and cultural transformation. The excitement and idealistic optimism of this moment is reflected in a song celebrating the founding of the university, which appeared in the student magazine, the *Gryphon*, in June 1910. Looking towards the future, the final verse concludes:

So brace your limbs and thews
And come to a decision
That Leeds shall distance all
The prophet sees in vision

On us has devolv'd
The spirit of the dawning
So pull together Leeds
Create a glorious morning! (Tartar 89)

When Michael Sadler arrived to take up the post of Vice-Chancellor in the autumn of 1911, the *Gryphon* records him addressing the students in a similar vein:

A great responsibility rested, he said, upon the people of our generation – on every one to whom he was speaking, for this period was one of three great Renaissances. It was a time of great intellectual vigour; the responsibility which rested upon us was not only intellectual, however, but moral. ('Union' 26)

Within the context of this process of change and innovation, traditional boundaries on a variety of levels became porous and, in some instances, broke down to a remarkable degree for the period. Released from the draconian discipline of a mother whom she both loved and feared, the young Jameson thrived within this new atmosphere, plunging with enthusiasm and energy into university life. She became a member of the Debating Society, the Social Study Society, the Charity Organisation Society and the Woman's Discussion Society; she wrote for the student magazine, the *Gryphon*; and she was elected Secretary of the Women's Representative Council of the Union. By the time she reached her final year, she was prominent enough to be the subject of an affectionately satirical piece in the *Gryphon* and to feature in the students' songs on Degree Day.⁴ She had arrived at a place that was 'a home as much as a testing ground' (Jameson, 'University' 2).

Many of the curricula on offer at Leeds were newly evolving and experimental. Although more traditional departments, such as Philosophy and Classics, did exist, the older subjects were generally being overtaken by the new. Not only were there the technical departments pioneering new industrial developments, there were departments teaching new subjects such as Economics and English. Furthermore, the boundaries of the subjects themselves were flexible and porous: both History and English teaching ranged beyond the traditional parameters of their subjects, taking a Europe-wide perspective and

4 The satirical piece was 'Forthcoming Lectures', by Igdrasil. For a reference to the Degree Day incident, see *NTLP*, 88.

incorporating the philosophical and the political (Shimmin 123, 126).⁵ According to Herbert Read, who arrived at the university the year after Jameson left, the lack of any ‘such institution as a tutor’ also left students free to explore across the boundaries of academic subjects (166). The organic nature of the students’ educational experience was thus in direct contrast with an Oxbridge system exemplifying Cardinal Newman’s prescription that ‘the first step in intellectual training is to impress upon a boy’s mind the idea of science, method, order, principle and system’ (qtd. in Read 166–9). While Read himself studied for several degrees simultaneously, Jameson – who likewise recalled being ‘completely unsupervised’ – spent ‘whole days reading ... outside [her] curriculum’, in a university library that contained modern texts by such writers as Dostoevsky, Ibsen, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche (‘University’ 3). Jameson recalled struggling through books on economics and, as a member of the Social Study Society and the Women’s Discussion Society, gained a grounding in sociology and politics also. This unusually wide-ranging intellectual experience as an undergraduate may have contributed to her later reluctance to place aesthetic questions in a separate compartment from the rest of life.

Co-education – an innovation for the period – meant that sexual boundaries were also unusually relaxed. ‘As women students in a predominantly masculine University’, Jameson later wrote, ‘our lives must in more than one way have been very unlike life in, say, the Girton or Newnham of the time’ (‘University’ 3). Indeed, the pages of the *Gryphon* suggest the atmosphere of flirtation and romance that prevailed at least among the group of Arts students that dominated the journal between the autumn of 1910 and the summer of 1912, a group to which Jameson evidently belonged. A poem entitled ‘Lines to a Lost Ideal – on the Editorial Staff having fallen on Evil Days’ satirizes the gradual pairing off of all its members (Sandra 85). Unlike her closest women friends who continued to live at home, Jameson’s accommodation in lodgings where ‘there was no reason, provided you could get

5 In the first year of her B.A. in English, Jameson also had to study courses in Philosophy and French (NTLP 57).

in without disturbing your landlady, why you should come in before three or four o'clock' gave her an even greater degree of 'uncharted, unoverlooked independence', leaving her free to experiment sexually (*NPLP* 52; Jameson, 'University' 4). It seems likely, therefore, that the accounts of her student heroines' involvement in outdoor pre-marital sex in her first two novels are based on her own experience with her husband-to-be, C. D. Clarke, with whom she fell in love during her second year at Leeds. Nor was Jameson averse to a spot of two-timing once Clarke had graduated (a year earlier than herself) and gone south (*JNI* 57).

At the same time, Jameson was involved in feminist politics within the university. A report in the *Gryphon* reveals that at a meeting of the Social Study Society on 8 November 1910, she 'yielded to a temptation *with which she is often met*' and 'appealed for "Votes for Women"' (italics added, H.C.P. 29). Whether Jameson was also the young woman expelled from a formal university dinner in March 1912 for throwing the same 'plaintive cry' 'at the heart of the Minister of Education' history does not relate ('Court' 50). A formative influence on Jameson's feminist politics was the radical new Women's Discussion Society set up in October 1910. Considerably left of the W.S.P.U., the society showed a particular interest in the plight of ordinary working women, regarding the suffrage question as 'merely one aspect of the whole industrial and political position of women' and planning visits to 'factories and other places where women are employed to obtain some practical knowledge of the conditions under which women work' (J.C. 14). Its inaugural meeting heard a paper on 'Women's Wages' from Mrs. Dickenson, Secretary of the Lancashire and Cheshire Women's Trades Council, in which the latter strongly recommended the establishment of Trade Unions for women separate from men, and its second meeting was addressed by Isabella Ford, the influential Leeds feminist and socialist, and an old friend of Edward Carpenter (J.C. 32). The influence of the inaugural meeting on Jameson is manifest in her own advocacy of women's Trade Unions at a Social Study Society meeting the following month (H.C.P. 29). Her continuing involvement in the group is signalled by the

announcement of her projected contribution on 'Infant Mortality' in the *Gryphon* of February 1912 (G.M.D. 47).

Yet despite Jameson's feminist activism and the unusual degree of sexual freedom she experienced at Leeds, old barriers inevitably remained. Indeed, in comparison with the all-women Oxbridge colleges, an only partially co-educational new university brought disadvantages as well as advantages. Although they felt they had their own place, the women were 'a comparatively small body ... of little importance in the student community' and there was an absence of specific support for them – no 'pleasant intelligent woman don ... with a duty to counsel [them]' (Jameson, 'University' 3–4). Jameson's own tutor, C. E. Vaughan, made plain his dislike at 'having to teach young women reading for Honours' (Jameson, 'University' 2), while the young trainee priests – from the nearby Christian Socialist Community at Mirfield – with whom she studied English were not wholly free from an atavistic belief in 'the essential sinfulness of woman' (Jameson, *Clash* 51). It is not surprising, therefore, that Jameson's confident manner hid a 'profound uncertainty', nor that despite passing top out of her year, it was her nearest male rival in the English Honours School who was given a lectureship at Leeds, while she was 'fobbed off' with a one year research scholarship at the (conveniently distant) London University (JNI 53, 58). Even within the relatively innovative environment of this new university, Jameson's feminist defiance of patriarchy came at a price. Smarting, perhaps, from this painful lesson and deprived of the sisterly support of the Women's Discussion Society, when Jameson moved to London she would temporarily lose her sense of solidarity with other women, attempting to pass herself off as an honorary male.

More lasting influences on Jameson were two male-dominated varieties of socialism that sought, in their different ways, to break down traditional barriers between intellectual life and the industrial world.⁶ These were, firstly, the down-to-earth democratic socialism of

6 A third male-dominated variety of socialism that Jameson encountered at Leeds was the aforementioned Christian Socialism promulgated at Mirfield. The Guild Socialist movement advocated by the post-1910 *New Age* was closely associated with the Mirfield-inspired Church Socialist League (Steele 123), and it

certain radical professors within the university and, secondly, the mystical Nietzschean-socialism of the charismatic editor of the *New Age* and co-founder of the Leeds Arts Club, Alfred Orage.⁷ The radical academics at Leeds formed a loose-knit group regarded by the university authorities with varying degrees of caution if not alarm.⁸ These men included: the Professor of Chemistry, J. B. Cohen, a key figure in the development of the Leeds University Working Men's Club; the Professor of History, Arthur Grant, whose *Outline of European History* (1907) 'powerfully argued the case of democracy by relating the aspirations of the Labour movement to those of classical Greece' (Steele 84); the Professor of Economics, David MacGregor, president of the Social Study Society and author of *The Evolution of Industry* (1911), a handbook giving 'an impressive summary of the progress of the labour movement' (Steele 167, 219);⁹ Jameson's tutor, Frederic Moorman, who was actively involved in local politics and whose extensive dialect research was driven by a passionate belief in the intrinsic value of working-class culture; and, finally, Jameson's other (sexist) tutor, C. E. Vaughan, who was inspired by the New Liberalism of his cousin T. H. Green and who had published a critical edition of Rousseau's political writings entitled *The Romantic Revolt* (1907). All these men lived out their radical ideals with extraordinary energy and drive, using their academic expertise for the benefit of the wider community alongside their regular teaching commitments. Moorman, Vaughan and MacGregor, for instance, were all indefatigable tutors for the Workers Education Association, Moorman was also on a pressure group to provide playgrounds for elementary school children (Diary 12 March 1913) and Cohen was active in the smoke abatement movement (Steele 168).

may well be that insights gained from her contacts with Mirfield students contributed to Jameson's later suspicions regarding the movement's reactionary tendencies.

7 Although Orage himself did not give a label to his political philosophy, I have coined the term 'mystical Nietzschean socialism' by combining his 'mystical doctrine of Democracy' (qtd. in Steele 145) with the 'new Socialist-Nietzsche generation' of G. B. Shaw, a regular speaker at the Club in its early days (Bridgwater 198). See also Hynes's view that the *New Age* was 'an untidy mixture of socialism, Nietzscheanism and mysticism' (44).

8 Moorman's Diary indicates the ties between the various members of this group.

9 It is likely that *The Evolution of Industry* was one of the books on economics that Jameson 'struggl[ed] to understand' at this time (NTLP 56), since she later uses MacGregor's argument for the role of International Trusts in the production of goods in her series of articles on 'England and America' for the *English Review*.

The pages of the *Gryphon* bear witness to the respect and affection in which such tutors were held by the journal's radical student-contributors. In the *Gryphon* of March 1912, there is a lengthy and affectionate portrait of Professor Grant as a gentle pacifist whose teaching of history 'traces the growth of national consciousness, the development of international amity, and the progress of world ideas'. The article conveys the exciting experience of being taught by Grant, describing how he leads his students on an imaginary journey from Ancient Greece through the centuries until 'Chartism, Socialism, and all the aspects of modern democracy stand revealed to us, and we are on the threshold of today'. The penultimate sentence of the article provides an insight into the political inspiration his teaching offers, posing the question: 'And is not the man who has trod this long and devious path through the past, the man who is best fitted to see where the highway of the future is laid?' ('Imaginary' 56–7). The *Gryphon* also keeps its readers in touch with news about Professor Cohen's Working Men's Club, praising the 'heroic efforts' of both Cohen and his wife to maintain the club for the fifteen years of its 'precarious existence' and repeatedly urging students to make more effort to get involved (W.G. 21).

The proceedings of Professor MacGregor's Social Study Society receive regular coverage in the *Gryphon*, providing detailed summaries of lectures by visiting speakers. The respect in which MacGregor is held by the journal's editorial staff is also indicated by the publication of his series of articles keeping the students in touch with his economic and social researches while travelling abroad during the academic year of 1911–12, the only example of named contributions by a member of staff during Jameson's time at the university. Jameson was later to satirise MacGregor's society entertainingly in her first novel, *The Pot Boils* (1919), but the well-informed economic, social and political detail that pervades her fiction owes much to his early influence. Although the modest and unassuming Frederick Moorman does not feature in the *Gryphon*, former students Herbert Read and Arthur Ransome (who later became a journalist in revolutionary Russia) bore witness to the depth of his influence on them (Steele 94), while Jameson herself recorded

her appreciation for his support and encouragement in an unpublished piece on her time at Leeds ('University' 2–3). She also rather grudgingly conceded that she was 'very fortunate' to have been taught by that 'woman-hating humanist', C. E. Vaughan ('University' 2; JNI 54).

Alfred Orage's very different mystical Nietzschean-socialism emanated not only from his journal, but also from the Arts Club located two hundred yards down the hill from the university in Woodhouse Lane. Orage had founded the Club in 1903, together with his friend, Holbrook Jackson, before migrating to London and taking up editorship of the *New Age* in 1907.¹⁰ He continued to take 'a paternal interest in the Club and returned regularly over the next decade', while its members, in turn, 'avidly read' his journal which 'formed the basis of a continuing dialogue with the metropolis' (Steele 6, 8). Orage and Jackson's original intention in setting up the Arts Club had been 'to reduce Leeds to Nietzscheism' (Steele 126), but Orage's reading of Nietzsche in *Friedrich Nietzsche: The Dionysian Spirit of the Age* (1906) and *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism* (1906) makes it clear that he was accommodating the 'aristocratic radicalism' of that philosopher to the mystical evolutionary socialism of his earlier, more egalitarian mentor, Edward Carpenter (Brandes, qtd. in Bradley and McFarlane 79).¹¹ Carpenter's presence within Orage's reading of Nietzsche is suggested, for example, by his use of the word 'exfoliation' in *Nietzsche in Outline* (90, 133). This was a key term in Carpenter's mystical adaptation of Lamarck, denoting the organic process whereby both external social customs and conditioned selves are shed as new growth emerges from within the Self.¹² Carpenter's influence on Orage's reading of Nietzsche is also suggested by his somewhat disingenuous argument that 'there was in Nietzsche's conception of the Superman a good deal of mysticism, with which he himself

10 Initially, the editorship of the *New Age* was intended to be a joint venture, but Jackson left within the year to pursue an independent journalistic career.

11 See also Holbrook Jackson's interpretation of Carpenter in terms of Nietzsche, qtd. in Rowbotham, 339. For the similarities and differences between Carpenter and Nietzsche, see Bridgwater. For the remarkable extent of Carpenter's impact as a political and cultural thinker and reformer, see Rowbotham 220–3, 297–8, 312–5; Copley 86–98; Lucas, *Radical* 50–1; Gandhi 34–5.

12 For both Carpenter and Whitman's adaptation of Lamarck, see Gershenowitz.

was scarcely in conscious sympathy' (*Friedrich* 73). The result was a holistic political philosophy that prioritized 'the emancipation of the soul of man' above 'the abolition of economic poverty' and that consequently regarded the Arts as inseparable from Politics (Orage, 'Towards Socialism: III' 393; 'Future' 8).¹³

Under the influence of Edward Carpenter – author of 'Non-Governmental Society' – and *his* mentor, Walt Whitman, Orage's Nietzschean-socialism initially had an anarchistic flavour.¹⁴ While Orage encouraged debate between all shades of 'radical' political opinion in the pages of the *New Age*, in his early editorials for the journal he allied himself with 'the turbulent spirit of the democratic Dionysus' against an 'Apollan' attempt 'to revive Aristocracy' and declared 'a passionate desire to break ... all bounds ... whether human or divine' ('Infant' 89; 'Mystical' 399). During this early phase, Orage also supported the emancipation of women. Picking up on Carpenter's theory that 'the Outcast of one age is the Hero of another' (*Civilisation* 143), he argued that 'the five outcasts of civilization' – 'women, the poor, artists, children, and criminals' – must be given the opportunity for self-realisation ('Votes' 300).

Yet the notion of social hierarchy and the potential for elitism were there from the beginning within Orage's attempt to reconcile socialism with Nietzsche, the desires of a meritocratic elite with the needs of the many, while the hierarchical ideas of his favourite philosopher, Plato, were never far from Orage's thought (Steele 91). In *Nietzsche in Outline* Orage had argued that 'democracy, or the many must decay and perish unless aristocracy and the few are revived and strengthened', since 'specially endowed and uniquely gifted' individuals had the capacity 'to experience ahead of the race' and thus had an essential role as an avant-garde (127, 171, 175). At this stage, however, Orage was still defining the 'true

13 Other influences on the Club were Theosophy, to which Carpenter introduced Orage, William Morris's Arts and Crafts Movement and, through Morris, Ruskin.

14 For Carpenter's anarchism, see Cachin. For Orage's early anarchist sympathies, see also 'Concerning', where he argues that 'it will take a good deal of Anarchism to make Sidney Webb's Socialist State endurable', and 'Sacrifice' (280). His two books on Nietzsche also place great emphasis on the Dionysian side of that philosopher.

aristocrat' as one who 'desires that *all* men shall be like himself free, self-ruling, self-choosing' (171). At this stage, too, he had faith that 'public opinion *always* passes a sound judgment' provided that it is educated with 'intellectual frankness', and envisaged the early *New Age* fulfilling this educational role (*italics added*, 'Education' 167–8). By Jameson's final year at Leeds, however, when it had become clear that the working-class had little or no interest in benefiting from his altruism, Orage's views had become more 'Apollan'.

Commentators as diverse as Wallace Martin, Tom Gibbons and Anne Fernihough, all detect a shift towards an increasingly conservative, 'classical' or Apollonian, approach to both politics and aesthetics within the *New Age* around 1911 (Martin 213; Gibbons 113; Fernihough, 'Go in Fear' 485). In May 1911, Orage declared his new, anti-progressive belief that 'man is a fixed species' ('End' 84), and by January 1912 the journal had begun a series of articles outlining a new 'neo-medieval' political philosophy that would become known as 'Guild Socialism' (Martin 197). Guild Socialism was 'an ingenious synthesis of political Socialism and industrial syndicalism' in which trade unions would become guilds, with each guild controlling the quality and price of products in its own industry and looking after the social welfare of its members (Martin 208). A democratically elected central government would 'regulate the guilds, enact national legislation, and conduct international affairs' (Martin 209). Although Martin sees the post-1910 *New Age* as pulling off a unique achievement in combining 'a conservative theory of value with a progressive political philosophy' (198), Steele is perhaps nearer the mark in describing Guild Socialism as a failed 'attempt by professional workers of the newly emergent technological, creative, educational and supervisory stratum to make common cause with the working class but *under the terms of their own dominance*' (*italics added*, 19).¹⁵ At the same time, the *New Age* abandoned its early support for the feminist movement, becoming increasingly and

15 See also Gibbons's view that 'Orage's guild socialism was a programme for a hierarchically structured commonwealth led by an evolutionary aristocracy' (26). It is also noteworthy that a French version of the same organizational theory was promoted by the pro-classical, Monarchist Action Française (Antliff 20–1).

offensively misogynistic.¹⁶ Culturally, it moved away from the literary realism of ‘the socially conscious writers whom it had championed during its early years’ and towards a more reactionary ‘classical’ formalism interpreted by both Orage and T. E. Hulme – in their different ways – as representing the existence of timeless spiritual values beyond the human (Martin 143). In contrast, the Leeds Arts Club, under the influence of the new Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University, Michael Sadler, developed an expressionist aesthetic that was more in keeping with Orage’s ‘romantic’ early thought, valuing as it did a more individual or psychologically expressive vision as exemplified by the abstract painting of the pro-anarchist expressionist, Kandinsky.¹⁷

Although there is no record of Jameson joining the Arts Club, she later recollected deriving her radical ideas from the *New Age* among other sources while at Leeds (*NTLP* 56). In addition, the influence of the Club (and through it, of the *New Age*) would have permeated the intellectual environment of the university through a number of channels. Firstly there were those members of the university’s academic staff who were involved in the Club. The mystical university chaplain, Arthur Lee, had been a founder member and was on the Club’s management committee; both Jameson’s English teacher, Frederic Moorman, and Arthur Grant were also members, as was the Vice-Chancellor, Michael Sadler, following his arrival in Leeds in 1911; and Vaughan, MacGregor and Cohen all lectured there. Further links included talks given to the Women’s Discussion Society and the Social Study Society by two members of the Arts Club management committee, Isabella Ford and W. H. Perkins (a friend of Moorman’s) respectively, while the university’s spacious Great Hall was the venue for many of the Arts Club’s large-scale events which could be attended by non-members for the price of 6d (Steele 158). During Jameson’s time, these included a talk by G. B. Shaw, in December 1909, advocating the establishment of a theatre in Leeds as vehicle for spreading modern ideas; one by W. B. Yeats on the

16 For Orage’s changing views on women’s rights, see R. Allen and Rentfrow.

17 For Orage’s post-1910 ‘classicism’, see Martin 235–65; for the Club’s contrasting interest in Kandinsky, see Steele 201–5.

‘Modern Dramatic Movement in Ireland’ in November 1910, with Vaughan in the chair, and one by G. K. Chesterton entitled ‘What’s Wrong with the Drama?’ in February 1911. There was also a talk by Hillaire Belloc on ‘The Classical Drama’ at an unspecified location in the university in February 1912 (Steele 150–1, 158–9, 187). Given the high level of Jameson’s involvement in university life and the fact that she went on to write her M.A. thesis on modern drama, it is likely that she attended some, if not all, of these events.

Evidence that a number of students at the university were *au fait* with the ideas of the Arts Club during Jameson’s time at Leeds is to be found in the pages of the *Gryphon*. In one satirical contribution, ‘On Culture and the Cultured Person’, we find the cultured person described as one who subscribes to the cult of ‘genius’, studies Shaw and knows all about ‘the mystical doctrine of democracy, and the Superman’ (Little John 59), while in another, a young man’s culture is measured by the fact that he reads ‘Nietzsche in the original with Perfect Ease’ (A.R.T. 59). In addition, the pages of the *Gryphon* reflect its student-contributors’ awareness of a shift – occurring from 1911 onwards – in the aesthetic theories and interests of both the *New Age* and the Arts Club. This awareness would have been fostered, in particular, by the arrival in the autumn of 1911 of the new Vice-Chancellor, Michael Sadler, a proselytizer for post-impressionism who soon became a leading figure in the Arts Club (Steele 182–3). Thus while in November 1910 it is the mark of culture to read Shaw, by the following academic year Zola, Ibsen and Shaw are attacked for their ‘matter-of-factness’ (H.B.C. 54) and the fashionable critic is characterized as belonging to:

a race which dined itself, with Shelley and Omar Khayyam [sic] for breakfast, Debussy for lunch, with Post-impressionism and Futurism alternating as menu for dinner; a people which read ‘Rhythm’ in place of ‘Punch’, and which adjourned to the Exhibition at the Art Gallery instead of retiring to bed. (Quintillian 74)¹⁸

18 *Rhythm* was a ‘little magazine’ launched by Middleton Murry in the summer of 1911. Jameson’s future publisher, the Vice-Chancellor’s son, Michael Sadleir, had persuaded his father to provide financial support for the venture.

The *Gryphon* of March 1912 also gives an enlightened account of the post-impressionist paintings which 'Leeds has, at last, had some opportunity of seeing' (presumably at the afore-mentioned 'Exhibition at the Art Gallery') (W.W. 54–5). It is notable that 'W.W.' reflects the Arts Club's recently developed romantic-expressionist interpretation of modernist abstraction, as opposed to Hulme's 'classical' anti-humanist one. Thus he believes that the task of the artist is to 'see into the inner meaning of things' and to 'record his impression according to emotion and not knowledge of what really is' (W.W. 55).

Although there was clearly a certain amount of shared ground between the Arts Club and the more left-wing members of the university staff, Moorman and MacGregor's appalled response to Michael Sadler's encouragement of his students to blackleg during the Municipal Strike of 1913 is symptomatic of the different emphases of the two groups.¹⁹ While the genuinely egalitarian tutors at the university were practically concerned with the amelioration of working-class poverty and deprivation, the general tone of the Arts Club, as exemplified by Sadler, was more patriarchal and more concerned with what was seen as the working-class's benighted spiritual condition. The disquiet of Jameson's tutors at the elitist propensities of the Club is revealed in two talks, the first given by Vaughan to the Swarthmore Quaker Adult Education Centre in February 1910 and the second given by Moorman to the Arts Club in March 1912. In the first Vaughan 'roundly denounced the cult of hero-worship he found in [Nietzsche and Carlyle], two of the club's pantheon of writers', while in the second, significantly entitled 'Poetry and Life', Moorman argued that what the Club needed was 'a non-romanticist poetry-writing section which would deal with present-day life in Leeds', as opposed to romantic poetry about the 'golden age of martial men' (Steele 159, 188). Similarly, in *The Evolution of Industry*, Macgregor attacked what he saw as a 'new English aristocracy' of charismatic leaders, whom he regarded as the main

19 MacGregor was one of those who demanded Sadler's resignation from the Leeds branch of the WEA in protest (Steele 197). Moorman's Diary for 21 November 1913 records a planned meeting with MacGregor to discuss the problem.

obstacle to reform, arguing that '[i]t is against the personal force of this new aristocracy that democratic causes strike and fall back in a weaker wave' (qtd. in Steele 167).

The contributors' awareness of the differences between the two types of socialism represented by the *New Age* and the Arts Club, on the one hand, and their own radical tutors, on the other, comes across clearly in the pages of the *Gryphon*, as does the majority opinion in favour of the latter. Thus 'Little John' sends up the ineffectual arrogance of the 'new age' student who 'stands at the headland of the field and criticizes', confident in his Nietzschean superiority (9), while A.R.T.'s 'Fascinating Freddy' – who reads Nietzsche in the original, holds 'Advanced Ideas' and 'sp[ea]ks *in vague terms* of Social Reform' – gets a suitable comeuppance (*italics added*, 59). Aphorisms published in February 1912 also echo Vaughan, Moorman and MacGregor's disapproval of Nietzschean-socialist elitism, for example: 'The highest form of art will be the one which has the widest appeal' and 'Art will only vivify life when it ceases to be the exclusive monopoly of virtuosi and becomes the national possession of the people' ('Aphorisms' 44).

However, the fullest evidence of disagreement amongst the students themselves and of their awareness of that disagreement as an important issue can be found in a series of six contributions on the reality or unreality of art published shortly before the end of Jameson's time at Leeds. The exchange was sparked off in February 1912 by an article signed Jim, Jameson's nickname at the time.²⁰ The article also reflects some of Jameson's later concerns as a writer, so that it seems extremely likely that it was written by her. Significantly entitled 'The Unreality of Art', it sets an anarchistic value on 'the free un-self-conscious life' but takes a more negative view than either the Arts Club or the *New Age* of the powers of imagination, attacking the alienating effects of literary pursuits and the tendency of the artist – and the arts student in particular – towards 'morbid self-introspection' (36). A rhetorical question towards the end of Jim's piece may be an early example of Jameson writing back to an unnamed intertext, in this case Edward Carpenter's

20 For references to Jameson as 'Jim' see *JNI*, 56, 139.

The Art of Creation (1904). In the latter text, Carpenter argues that as humanity becomes more civilized, the primitive instinct of fear – having become unnecessary and destructive – will wither away, to be superseded by the more advanced instincts of love and brotherhood. Jim, on the other hand, firmly answers, ‘Never’, to the question, ‘When will the earth be free from the shadows of man’s imagination, the terrified inheritance of the savage?’ (‘Unreality’ 6).²¹

The position taken by H.B.C.’s article, ‘The Reality of Art’, in the following issue, is much more unquestioningly that of the anti-materialist Arts Club and *New Age*, criticizing ‘the age’ for ‘seeking to live by bread alone’ and setting against the ‘matter-of-factness [which] is now our god ...’ the higher consciousness of Art (54). H.B.C. calls for a Nietzschean ‘prophet to rise in our wilderness’ and preach the doctrine that ‘the matter-of-fact is not the real ... Necessity is not Freedom’ (54). In the correspondence columns of the same issue, there is a lighter contribution in the same vein (Midge 59). At the opposite end of the spectrum from these ‘new age’ articles are two subsequent contributions adopting the more down-to-earth economic-socialist perspective of MacGregor’s Social Study Society (Quintillian 74–5; W.G.G. 3).

Finally, rounding off the controversy that she is somewhat abashed at having provoked, Jim returns to the fray on the side of the democratic socialists. Reiterating her original points, she argues that too much introspection is unhealthy and that ‘experience of, and sympathy with, the simple facts of common life and human emotion’ must be brought to the study of literature if it is to have any value (‘To the Editor’ 93–4). This emphasis on a combination of objective fact and human empathy anticipates Jameson’s later well-known call for a sociologically-inclined documentary fiction in ‘Documents’, where she argues that middle-class socialist writers should have direct experience of working-class

21 In the spring of 1904, in a session that Moorman is likely to have attended, Carpenter had given a paper to the Club entitled ‘Deities and Devils in the Light of Race Memory’ (Steele 75). This seems to have been an early version of Chapter X of *The Art of Creation*, which refers to ‘fear’ as a kind of ‘devil’ within race consciousness to be replaced by the ‘deity’ of human sympathy.

hardship but should not become preoccupied with their own emotional reactions to it, instead becoming ‘conduits for a feeling which is not personal’ (13). However, if Jameson’s cogitations on ‘the unreality of art’ and her feeling that she would have done better to have studied Economics or Biology rather than English suggest the influence of her tutors’ down-to-earth approach, that influence would soon be abandoned for Orage’s more mystical Nietzschean-socialism as she plunged into the modernist vortex of pre-war London (*NTLP* 57).

Apollonian London and Aesthetic Modernism: Autumn 1912–April 1914

The talkers of our day ... became bitter and wrote unkind manifestos ... were abusive and superior, ... and each according to the best and newest tradition. ... It was not to be expected that we should escape the plague. (*HH* 45)²²

Between September 1912 and the end of 1913 Jameson lived in London while she studied for her M.A. first at University College and then at King’s. Although, as a result of penury, she returned home to Whitby to finish writing up in January 1914, London remained firmly in her sights until she had sent her completed thesis off to Leeds in April of the same year, since – while at home – she submitted articles for publication to both the *New Age* and the *Egoist* and seriously considered taking up a job on the latter. Jameson’s first extended experience of the capital thus overlapped with the period that Michael Levenson has designated ‘this notable year in the history of the avant-garde’ (126). According to Levenson’s widely admired analysis, ‘modernism was individualist before it was anti-individualist, anti-traditional before it was traditional, inclined to anarchism before it was inclined to authoritarianism’ and the period between the summer of 1913 and the summer of 1914 was the hinge for this modernist shift (which we have already seen beginning to occur in the *New Age*) from the ‘romantic’ or Dionysian to the ‘classical’ or Apollonian (79).

22 In his posthumously published autobiography, *Nine Lives*, Sydney Harland writes that *The Happy Highways* is based on Jameson’s ‘life with us as a student’ (35).

The following are some of the significant ‘hinge moments’ that occurred during the eighteen months it took Jameson to complete her M.A.: in October 1912, the Second Post-Impressionist Exhibition was held at the Grafton Galleries; between 25 December 1913 and 30 April 1914, T. E. Hulme edited a series of drawings by Jacob Epstein, Henri Gaudier-Brezska, David Bomberg, Henry Nevinston, Edward Wadsworth and William Roberts and wrote the first three in a series of seminal essays on ‘Modern Art’, both for the *New Age*; on 15 June 1913, the *Freenwoman* was resurrected (following a short interval) as the *New Freenwoman*, and on 1 January 1914, metamorphosed into the *Egoist*, publishing Wyndham Lewis’s defence of post-impressionism, ‘The Cubist Room’, in its first issue; on 2 February 1914, Ezra Pound threw down his gauntlet in defence of ‘the new sculpture’ in an article of that name also in the *Egoist*; and in April 1914, Wyndham Lewis’s Rebel Art Centre was established.

This was a time when ‘antagonism between the avant-garde sects themselves’ was as great as the avant-garde’s confrontation with ‘a senescent establishment’ (Levenson 123) and Jameson herself became part of the *zeitgeist*, exchanging the open, egalitarian atmosphere of Leeds University for a small, arrogantly exclusive avant-garde ‘sect’ of her own, which had ‘got Orage as it might be religion’ and considered the *New Age* its Bible (*CJ* 10; *NTLP* 90). This ‘sect’ included an inner circle, a ‘foreign body with four heads’ consisting of Jameson herself, and the three young men with whom she shared lodgings – her old school friends, Sydney and Oswald Harland, and their friend and fellow Yorkshire man, Archie White – and an outer circle, consisting of a student discussion society called the Eikonoklasts to which they all belonged (*JNI* 66). Dedicated to ‘the unmasking of hypocrites, politicians, clericals, reactionaries, bigots, and dogmatists of all ages and conditions’ (*JNI* 65), the Eikonoklasts may well have been inspired by Orage’s early call, in *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism*, for ‘iconoclasts, mockers, destroyers’ to bring about progress in contemporary society (155–7). As if seeking the great man’s approval, Oswald

Harland submitted 'Iconoclasm', a semi-fictional account of the society, to the *New Age* in February 1913.

Yet the group's creed was closer to the *New Age*'s early anarchistic Nietzschean-socialism than to its later classicism. Indeed, in *Journey* Jameson avers that the *New Age* only furnished her and her friends with 'the less anarchical half' of their ideas, the likely source of the other half being Marsden's more overtly anarchistic journal, the *New Freewoman* (June–December 1913) (JNI 67). Oswald Harland, in particular, was a committed anarchist (NTLP 63). Millom, the 'immoralist, amoralist and idealist' character in his novel *The Golden Plough* (1929), who 'had preached the gospel of Bakunin in the hinterlands of Battersea', may well be a self-portrait (90). The dictum that 'one's bound to be egotistic, but one needn't be a goat about it', expressed in O. Harland's novel *Dominance*, suggests a compromise between egoistic anarchism and social responsibility similar to that at the heart of Orage's earlier Nietzschean-socialist philosophy, while the novel's semi-autobiographical hero, David Alden, offers a more idealistic version of the same doctrine, arguing that 'power ... should not grow outward but inward', for such 'new altruism ... would save the world' (204, 277).²³ An incident from Sydney Harland's posthumous autobiography, *Nine Lives*, suggests that the older brother was not much less anarchistic than the younger: in this incident from 1911 the young Sydney gets involved in a fight with his landlady's son during which a gas bracket is torn off the wall (33). In *The Pot Boils*, Jameson would aptly combine Sydney's story with reports of the (appropriately named) Sidney Street Siege from the same year, in which two alleged Russian anarchists were besieged by police in a house in Stepney and eventually perished in the ensuing fire (PB 149–69). In Jameson's fictional version, a Czech and a Russian anarchist destroy the lodgings of a third anarchist, the English Norden, in a fight which again causes a gas bracket to get broken.²⁴

23 For Orage's view that Nietzschean power should be 'power over the self', see *Nietzsche* 47.

24 The siege was reported on and discussed in the *New Age*.

The group's profound disapproval of Fabian scientific materialism and impatience with parliamentary democracy reflected attitudes that were prevalent within Orage's *New Age* almost from the start and were in marked contrast to the more practical and democratic views of Jameson's old tutors at Leeds. They are evident in contributions made to the journal both by Oswald Harland and by Jameson herself. O. Harland's 'The Triumph of Lucifer', a pastiche of Anatole France's *La Revolté des Anges*, represents Lucifer as a corrupt Labour Party politician who successfully usurps God in order to line his own pockets; Jameson's satirical obituary of the Fabian playwright George Bernard Shaw, 'The End Thereof', berates Shaw for his attempt to marry 'a Nietzschean philosophy' with 'the programme of the Liberal-Labour Party' (482–3); and her Swiftian satire, 'New Statesman: A Bill Providing for an Economic Basis of Marriage', is a mock-Fabian Tract advocating polygamy, in a most practical manner, on the basis that six labourers 'earning £1 a week or less' would be able to afford to keep one woman between them (682)! The Eikonoklasts also wrote an 'insolent' letter to the recently founded *New Statesman*, an organ of the Fabian Society that was set up to rival the *New Age* (JNI 66).

In place of what they saw as the Fabians' reductive scientific materialism, the group followed the *New Age* in placing more emphasis on subjective experience, although its emphasis was more scientific than mystical. Freud was among those writers whom they admired 'sincerely and blindly' and they sat up late at night to discuss questions such as: 'Are thoughts the experiences of the nervous system?' (JNI 66; NTLP 68).²⁵ The driving force behind the group's interest in this new and radical science is likely to have been that maverick, Sydney Harland, who was in the habit of reading scientific journals while an undergraduate and whose Wellsian pastiche, 'Raving of an Immature Science Student',

25 Freud was first mentioned in the *New Age* as early as February 1912 and *The Interpretation of Dreams*, the first of his texts to be translated into English, was published in 1913 (Martin 139–40). In addition, the president of the London Psycho-Analytic Society, Ernest Jones, published his *Papers on Psycho-Analysis* in 1912 and M. D. Eder, secretary of the latter society and contributor to the *New Age*, published a translation of *On Dreams* in 1914. Freud's Oedipus complex was the subject of Jameson's first published story, 'Mother-Love' (1919).

published in the *New Age* in 1913, makes a serious criticism of science's 'profound but unjustifiable contempt for things not seen' (360). Sydney's scientific curiosity regarding the still popular though more old-fashioned area of psychical research is suggested by an episode from *The Happy Highways* in which Mick Hearne, a character based on Sydney, attempts to make spiritual contact with Aldabeezar III, the Guardian of the Lintel. Having read one of Orage's favourite texts, the *Mahabharata*, 'for local colour', fasted for a fortnight and then taken an unspecified drug on the recommendation of an Irish spiritualist who sounds suspiciously like W. B. Yeats, Mick fails to make contact with the said Aldabeezar III (HH 75). Instead, he has a dramatic drug-induced experience – 'His thoughts mounted up in a spiral of white flame to a point of dazzling light, and there burst into fiery rays' – and then falls unconscious (HH 75). Mick is also said to indulge in lengthy monologues in which he would 'abuse Bergson and the Sidney Webbs', suggesting that this, too, was a habit of Sydney's (HH 74). As a regular reader of the *New Age*, Sydney would have learnt about Bergson's philosophy from articles T. E. Hulme devoted to the subject between July 1909 and February 1912.

Where the group was in direct opposition to the editorial perspective of the then-current *New Age*, however, was in its continued belief in a Nietzschean variety of evolutionary socialism, as against Orage's shift to a more anti-progressive view of Man as 'a fixed species' ('End' 84). In explaining his more recent view, Orage had compared the human mind to a goat chained by its tether. The recurrence of variations on this trope throughout Jameson's *oeuvre* bears witness to the impact that Orage's dramatic *volte face* had on her, and to her lasting struggle to retain belief in *some* form of human agency and social progress even once she had left behind the youthful confidence of this early evolutionary socialist period.²⁶ Yet before the war at least, she and her friends retained their evolutionary-socialist optimism: 'We *knew* we were at the frontier of a new age ... of social justice, freedom, perpetual peace ... the world was facing towards it; there was nothing

26 For examples of the tether trope, see PB 281; HH 186; CJ 157; JNI 228.

much we need do, except think, talk, exist' (*JNI* 65). In Sydney Harland's aforementioned article 'Raving of an Immature Science Student', and a second contribution to the *New Age* by his brother, the group's evolutionism is expressed with a self-protective irony unsurprising given the articles' journalistic context. In the former pastiche, Sydney facetiously predicts the evolutionary demise of a 'Force-bereft humanity' and the rise of an entirely new species of insect with a 'Transcendental Mind and Brain' (360). (The nature of this imaginary species is suggestive of the youthful Sydney's Nietzschean impatience with Orage's tendency towards mysticism.) Oswald Harland's evolutionist piece, 'Ash Wednesday', has rather more disturbingly Nietzschean overtones. Ironically subverting the Christian belief in other-worldly salvation that its title evokes, the piece is a symbolic anecdote in which a philosophical group – resembling Jameson's 'foreign body with four heads' – visits a country pub. Returning home at dusk, the group watch the distant pub becoming an illuminated 'symbol of eternal welcome, strong as life itself' in the encroaching darkness. Then, coming across a lame partridge, they 'fl[i]ng [them]selves on it and kick] it to death' (526). Although the piece ends on a note of melancholic uncertainty, the suggestion that 'life' requires the sacrifice of the weakest remains.

The attitude of the male members of the 'foreign body with four heads' towards women seems to have been a mixture of the enlightened and the traditional, its more unattractive elements influenced, no doubt, by Nietzsche and the misogyny of the contemporary *New Age*. The young men's acceptance of Jameson as a fellow student within their group and their support for her to join the Eikonoklasts – against the resistance of other, more misogynistic members of that society – was extremely enlightened for the period. At the same time, whether consciously or not, they appear to have believed that women were less highly evolved than men, whatever their long-term potential. Thus they treated Jameson with an unthinkingly superior attitude, assuming that she was in need of being educated by them, routinely criticizing her for 'calfishness' and expecting her to accept her lowly status in the group with 'servile' gratitude (*NTLP* 60–1). Above all, the

high value that they placed on anarchistic self-expression and the Nietzschean Will led to a failure to understand and sympathise with the social constraints placed on women during this period, and particularly the high social premium still placed on marriage.²⁷ This failure of understanding led Sydney Harland – the member of the group who most empathized with women – to condemn Jameson’s marriage to Charles Clarke as ‘bourgeois weakness’, and to go on, himself, to have children by four different women, only two of whom he married (*NLP* 82).

Regrettably, Jameson’s treatment as an honorary male who should be grateful for the honour, produced in her a kind of double-think whereby she felt both inferior viz-à-viz other men and arrogantly impatient of more conventional women. It also left her totally unprepared for the problems she would later have to face as a wife and mother. For now, however, Jameson displayed a recklessness that was entirely in keeping with the spirit of the Eikonoklasts, defying her professors and insisting on a topic of her own choosing for her M.A. thesis, namely a study of modern European drama ‘judged from the standpoint of the new age’ (*MDE* 163). Meriting more detailed attention, that study’s ‘new age’ standpoint is the subject of Chapter 2. It is enough here to observe that the thesis shows Jameson abandoning her earlier suspicions regarding the ‘unreality of art’ and adopting the early *New Age*’s belief in the power of the Arts to effect spiritual and hence social change.

Whilst completing her thesis, Jameson also became involved with Dora Marsden’s anarcho-modernist journal, the *Egoist*. The story of the true level of this involvement has already been told in the Introduction to this thesis. What has not yet been mentioned is a letter to the journal’s then-editor, Harriet Shaw Weaver, dated 22 January, 1918, in which Marsden writes,

I cave in re. Miss Jameson ... You know Constable’s are bringing out her book (novel) ...? I will read it and unless there is something radically different in that I shall say we’ve been ‘took in’. I’m sorry. I hoped she would turn out rather good. (Harriet Shaw Weaver Papers)

27 For a perceptive account of the social pressures that persisted even for Bohemian New Women during the modernist period, see Brooker, 106–9.

What follows is an attempt to explore some of the possible reasons for Marsden's disillusionment with Jameson. Her feeling of having been 'took in' may have been justified, to a certain extent, since Jameson was not above a bit of ideological impersonation. For example, in her review of a performance of Zangwill's *The Melting Pot* at the Queen's Theatre in April 1914, aware of Marsden's nominalist critique of collective causes, Jameson ridicules the very evolutionary socialist faith with which she had so recently concluded her M.A. thesis (155). Yet Marsden's disillusionment with Jameson was also an inevitable consequence of an initial assumption of shared attitudes – on both sides – that was based on an entirely understandable misreading of the situation, for although the values of the 'socialist' *New Age* and the 'individualist anarchist' *Egoist* can rightly be seen as constructed 'against' one another, there were also certain important continuities between the two journals (Beasley 94).²⁸

Perhaps the most important similarity between Orage and Marsden as editors was a shared belief in Art as a form of truth-telling and therefore in the centrality of the artist to the renewal of society. Marsden's view that women's awakening should be spiritual rather than social or political, and her consequent opposition to the Suffrage movement, were also attitudes that she shared with the *New Age*'s Beatrice Hastings *before* she slid into a masochistic misogyny. Indeed, for Jameson, who had first encountered Orage's journal in its early anarchistic phase, the continuities between the *New Age* and Marsden's *Egoist* must have been at least as striking as their differences. For example, in his Bergsonian phase T. E. Hulme shared Marsden's anarchistic disdain for linguistic and philosophical abstraction and, in this way, both philosophers 'played key roles in the formation and promotion of Imagism' (Garver 136). Certainly, Jameson's offer to do some literary 'slaughtering' for the

28 Mary Gawthorpe, the co-founder of the *Egoist*'s original incarnation as the *Freewoman* (Nov 1911–Oct 1912), knew Orage well and had been an early member of the Leeds Arts Club, while the *Freewoman*, the *New Freewoman* and the *Egoist* between them shared, and even on occasion poached, a number of the *New Age*'s key contributors as well as sharing a very similar readership of first-generation university-educated meritocrats. On the readership of Marsden's *New Freewoman* and *Egoist*, see Morrison, 107–8; on the readership of the *New Age*, see Scholes, 'General Introduction'.

Egoist would have been equally in keeping with the anarchistic tendencies of both Marsden's journal and that early *New Age* student-society, the Eikonoklasts.²⁹

Nonetheless, there were fundamental differences between the anarchistic Nietzschean-socialism of the early *New Age* and Marsden's egoistic variety of anarchism influenced by Max Stirner. Orage's *Nietzsche in Outline*, for example, was informed by Carpenter's mystical faith in an organic link between the microcosm of the Individual and the macrocosm of Nature, such that 'the true egoist is not egotistic ... but in fact fulfills nature's inscrutable evolutionary purpose, selflessly enacting nature's progressive will' by pointing the way to a freer future that will – ultimately – be shared by all (Weston, qtd. in Clarke 67). Marsden's egoistic anarchism, on the other hand, was purely amoral, having cut through this mystical connection and become an 'affirmation of pure existential velocity *without the drag of a predetermined or collective destination*' (italics added, Clarke 99). As *The Encyclopedia Britannica* of 1910 remarks, the 'amoralism' of this Stirnerian form of anarchism found a hearing 'only in limited artistic and literary circles' ('Anarchism' 6); it was not of a nature to appeal to Jameson who was, at heart, a committed socialist. When, during the Great War, Jameson could no longer reconcile her anarchism with her socialism, she took the opposite step to Marsden, leaving the former rather than the latter behind.

The difference between the philosophical and political positions of these two highly intelligent women would only have been exacerbated as Jameson began to discover the consequences of poverty and the limitation of the human will as a suburban housewife and mother.³⁰ These differences come most clearly into focus in Jameson's fifth article for the *Egoist*, 'England's Nest of Singing-Birds', an article with which Marsden was not entirely happy.³¹ A survey of the condition of contemporary English literature, the piece begins with a lament for the anarchistic artists of the Renaissance, who 'spilt life wantonly to show their love for it', but ends by giving the impression that all art is less important than the

29 See letter from Jameson to Marsden dated 18 December 1913 (Dora Marsden Collection).

30 For these later difficulties, see Chapter 3.

31 See Marsden's letter to Weaver dated November 1916 (Harriet Shaw Weaver Papers).

socialist struggle, as Jameson complains that ‘there is more weeping in Belgravia over one third-rate poet selling matches in the Strand than over a hundred buried miners’ (175-6). Similarly, in her review of Emma Goldman’s *Anarchism and Other Essays*, Jameson begins by echoing Marsden’s anarchistic line that ‘no person can be endowed with spiritual freedom. It must be taken’, but adds the crucial materialist qualification that if undertaken ‘today’ the process will be ‘painful’ ‘because of the small measure of economic security possible under the modern social system’ (136). Finally, although history does not relate whether Marsden ever got round to reading Jameson’s first novel, *The Pot Boils*, had she done so, she could not have failed to note that its natural readership was those very same ‘young Socialists and experts in Labour journalism’, whom her own editorials so regularly satirized (Rev. of *The Pot Boils* 151).

Conclusion

This chapter has traced Jameson’s youthful journey into a Nietzschean-socialist modernism that associated radical politics with art and the imagination via the less aesthetically-oriented version of socialism that she imbibed from her tutors at Leeds University (and that proved to have a greater influence on her in the long term). It has indicated how as a student both in Leeds and London, she was swept along by the euphoria of pre-war radicalism, wholly unaware of the European carnage to come. This chapter has noted Jameson’s involvement with the *Egoist* and explored possible reasons – other than her original refusal of a job offer in 1914 – why she never became fully integrated into Marsden’s anarcho-modernist journal. Finally, it has suggested how the masculinist utopianism which Jameson adopted in pre-war London failed to prepare her for the daily grind of the suburban housewife and mother and the frustration of her ambitions. Jameson’s literary response to the consequences of this failure, in her first novel, *The Pot Boils*, is the subject of Chapter 3, but first Chapter 2 discovers more about Jameson’s pre-

war knowledge of early modernism through a detailed discussion of her M.A. thesis on modern European drama.

Chapter 2

Reconciling Modernisms in Jameson's M.A. Thesis, 'Modern Drama in Europe' (1914)

At no other time, surely, have so many intellectuals cultivated so many alternative philosophies, often of mutually exclusive kinds. (Bridgewater 197)

Introduction

Jameson's decision to write her M.A. thesis on modern European drama reflects the influence both of the radically European focus of her curriculum at Leeds University and of the Leeds Arts Club's high valuation of drama as a vehicle for spreading modern ideas, a valuation promulgated through the lectures it organised at the University's Great Hall. It was a decision which led to Jameson's early and deep immersion in modernism, since – generally ahead of poetry and the novel – modernist drama 'had already staked out a distinctively modernist territory by the turn of the century' (Innes 130). Early modernist drama, with its 'affinity with the emergent psychological sciences' and its defamiliarisation of the 'real', was an important influence on later modernist practitioners, including those working in other media such as Henry James, James Joyce and the poet Rilke (Fletcher and McFarlane 517).¹ Yet modernist drama was also marked off from other forms of modernism by its inherently collaborative nature and by its more overt involvement with the social and historical world, which frequently produced a combination of both stylistic and social revolution. This, too, would have a major long-term influence on the way Jameson saw the relationship between literature and the modern world.

Beyond its consistent emphasis on the importance of Drama as a tool for spiritual and hence social transformation, a salient feature of Jameson's *Modern Drama in Europe* is the

1 For discussions of the influence of early modernist drama on later modernists, see Marker and Marker 55, 130; Fletcher and McFarlane 502; and Moi 65–6.

unstable mix of views it contains.² Some of its inconsistencies and contradictions may no doubt be put down to last minute revisions; others to the conditions in which Jameson completed her research during the second half of 1913 – poverty-stricken and half-starved having run through her grant, Jameson had compounded her problems by embarking on a disastrous marriage which led to a suicide attempt during this time (JNI 74–6). Yet *Modern Drama* is also a late (and consequently friable) example of ‘the reconciling turn of mind’ that characterized the Edwardian period, a turn of mind which was driven by a wide range of forms of secularized religion and was epitomized by the composite political philosophy of Nietzschean-socialism (Rose 3).³ An analysis of the various critical and theoretical strands within *Modern Drama* is particularly useful, not only because they shed light on the extent of the young Jameson’s knowledge of certain emergent forms of early modernism and on the sheer radicalism of her pre-war views, but also because she would go on to use them as key intertexts in her critique of her own youthful radicalism in her first two novels, *The Pot Boils* (1919) and *The Happy Highways* (1920).⁴

The analysis of *Modern Drama* that follows identifies ideas from four main strands of early or proto-modernist thought, all of which are associated either with the pre- or with the post-1910 *New Age*. These are: the dominant strand within Jameson’s text, namely the ‘romantic’ Nietzschean-socialism of Orage’s early *New Age* as it was applied to Drama by Ashley Dukes, the journal’s theatre critic from October 1909 to May 1911; a symbolist form of ‘new Classicism’ developed by Orage together with Dukes’s replacement, the Bergsonian Huntly Carter, as the journal shifted towards a more corporatist, anti-progressive position between 1911 and 1912; a more hard-edged and authoritarian form of

2 The following discussion of the M.A. thesis Jameson submitted in 1914 is based on its later publication as *Modern Drama in Europe* in 1920. Since Jameson spent no more than a fortnight revising the original text before sending it to the publisher (JNI 79), the published version seems a reasonable substitute for an original that is no longer available.

3 For discussions of various aspects of this phenomenon, see Rose, Ch.1; Gibbons, Ch.1; Richter; and Raphael, 295ff. For the somewhat incongruous role of Nietzsche therein, see Thatcher and Stone.

4 Six out of the eleven contributions that Jameson succeeded in placing either in the *New Age* or in the *Egoist* were derived from, or at least influenced by, her thesis, namely ‘End’, ‘Drama’, ‘Modern I’, ‘Modern II’, ‘Scene-Models’ and her theatre review for the *Egoist*, 16 March 1914.

classicism advocated by the Nietzschean, Anthony Ludovici, a regular contributor to the journal from the autumn of 1912 onwards; and the egalitarian evolutionary socialism of Edward Carpenter, which was itself one of the main influences on Orage's early combination of Nietzsche with socialism. Whilst Jameson tries, with only partial success, to weave three of these four strands together into a seamless argument, the 'new Classicism' of Orage and Carter receives different treatment. Jameson critiques its corporatist anti-progressivism in a thought-provoking intertextual dialogue suggesting the direction that her fiction would take in the 1920s. Finally, the following analysis also traces *Modern Drama's* critical treatment of women to its source in the varying degrees of misogyny manifest both in the pre- and in the post-1910 *New Age* and to the ideas of one of the journal's principal contributors, Beatrice Hastings, in particular.

Early *New Age* Nietzschean-Socialism

Jameson explains her predominantly Nietzschean-socialist approach to modern European drama in a Foreword entitled 'Nietzsche in Modern Drama' in which individual revolt and the good of society as a whole are equated. Here, she quotes one of Orage's favourite Nietzschean aphorisms – 'What is great in man is that he is a bridge and not a goal' – and argues, like him in his early books on Nietzsche, that the goal of Man is to contribute to the creation of a 'higher race' by 'bequeath[ing] to his children a finer heritage of courage and resolution' (xix).⁵ In *Nietzsche in Outline*, Orage had argued that 'to accomplish its task, humanity must win confidence in itself' and that 'this confidence is fed and nourished by the spectacle of its most powerful individuals' (48). Similarly, in *Modern Drama* Jameson argues that the role of Art is to 'give us inspiration, strength and faith in the power of the human spirit' and that, as a consequence, 'great plays cannot be written of little souls' (xxiv, 12). As in Orage's interpretation of Nietzsche, Jameson's definition of the powerful individual is one who has 'power to reach beyond the self to the finer than self' (xvi). As in

5 Orage quotes Nietzsche's bridge aphorism both in *Nietzsche* (43) and in *Friedrich* (65, 70).

early Orage (and in Nietzsche's own *Thus Spake Zarathustra*), the anarchistic process of revolt is seen by Jameson as necessarily involving 'pain and strife' but the goal of 'the new age' (or the Superman) is a worthwhile cause (xix).⁶

The work of the theatre critic, Ashley Dukes, offers Jameson a model of how Nietzschean-socialism can be applied to the criticism of modern European drama in particular.⁷ Jameson's thesis follows Dukes in tracing a series of evolutionary developments within modern European drama, from the artificiality of the well-made play to the realist drama of Ibsen and his followers and, finally, to a symbolist drama that is, in turn, a reaction against the matter-of-factness of a realism that, following Ibsen, has descended into mere imitation. Whilst both critics recognise the artistic merit of such dramatists as Maeterlinck and Hofmannstahl, they are less attracted by their symbolist drama than by a more Nietzschean and anarchistic 'drama of Becoming', 'Dionysian' being their highest term of praise (Dukes, *Modern* 10, 64; *MDE* 108, 200). Both critics agree with Strindberg that the dramatist must offer more than mere photographic realism (Dukes, *Modern* 30–1; *MDE* 28), although it is only Jameson who recurrently refers to 'vision' as the chief requirement of the great dramatist (*MDE* 2, 9, 31, 34, 279). For Dukes, 'the supreme test of the artist is the revelation of himself in his work ... as a great personality' (28–9).

Using very similar critical criteria as their starting point, Dukes and Jameson come to remarkably similar conclusions, with Jameson not averse to a spot of plagiarism on occasions. Thus Brioux, Sudermann, Galsworthy and Granville-Barker are all condemned by both critics because their characters lack individuality and are totally unmemorable. By contrast, Ibsen, Chekhov, Gorki and Wedekind, (trailing behind as a flawed 'Frau Nietzsche'), are all praised for creating dramas in which powerful individuals revolt against

6 In *Nietzsche*, Orage argues, for example, that what was needed was 'a type of mind that felt the struggle, and yet deliberately willed that it might increase' (23). He argues also that 'society is saved by its rebels' and that the 'self-surpassing' of 'the finest types of the race' is 'a victory for the race as a whole' (48, 107).

7 The following references to Dukes's criticism are taken from *Modern Dramatists* (1911), which is based on articles he wrote for the *New Age* between September and December, 1910 (Martin 74).

social norms (Dukes, *Modern* 97–8; *MDE* 153). In these tragedies, it does not matter that revolt is bound to fail, provided that the power of the individuals themselves remains unbroken. Both critics consider Tolstoy's socialist plays and *The Weavers*, Hauptmann's play about a strike, less successful, because their authors care more for their characters 'as a mass of humanity than as a group of possibly unsocial, anarchical individuals' (Dukes, *Modern* 185). Finally both critics also approve of those dramatists who focus not on social revolt but on the titanic 'struggle between nature and nature', singling out for praise Strindberg in particular, but also Bjornson's *Pastor Sang* (*MDE* xvii).

Following a brief summary of Dukes's critical approach in the *New Age*, Wallace Martin concludes that '[his] criticisms of the realistic method do not form a coherent critique of realism, nor do they suggest an alternative convention for the contemporary stage' (79). He does not, however, mention that Dukes went on to become the foremost exponent of German theatrical expressionism in England after the Great War (Furness 85–6). As the Leeds Arts Club had also discovered, expressionism was an aesthetic well suited to expressing the anarchistic and utopian political philosophy of Nietzschean-socialism.⁸ Although – like Dukes before the war – Jameson does not suggest 'an alternative convention for the contemporary stage' in *Modern Drama*, her view that Ibsen and Strindberg represent the highest achievement of modern theatrical realism suggest an aesthetic that is half-way between realism and expressionism. Thus Ibsen is praised not for his social criticism but because he was 'seeking in many forms the expression of the human spirit' (*MDE* 84). Jameson admires *Rosmersholm* in particular for the manner in which 'throughout the play, the inevitable pressure of disaster is never lifted. ... Rosmer's spiritual struggle, intimately conceived, *is* the action' (75–6). Despite her expressionist interest in the dramatic representation of extreme psychological states, Jameson is not prepared to leave realism behind altogether, however, as the concluding words of her thesis suggest: 'In God's name do not let us have a drama with its head among the stars unless its feet are

8 For expressionism and the Leeds Arts Club, see Chapter 1, p. 42.

firmly planted on the earth' (279).

Orage and Carter's Neo-Classical – or Neo-Medieval – Drama

One possible source for Jameson's interpretation of Ibsen in *Modern Drama* is Orage, who – together with Huntly Carter – took drama criticism in the *New Age* in a new direction following the departure of Dukes. In two important articles – 'Unedited Opinions: On Drama' and 'Unedited Opinions: On Action in Drama' – Orage extols Ibsen for his dramatic 'representation and ... illumination of the sub-conscious', lamenting: 'Since Ibsen died where is the dramatist who is not a materialist?' ('On Action' 371; 'On Drama' 58). He also gives as an example of the kind of drama he seeks that most proto-expressionist of plays, *King Lear*, arguing that 'to be made aware of the existence of the hidden forces of passion' is to have experienced true drama ('On Action' 371).⁹ However, if in his citation of *Lear* – with its emphasis on the individual's spiritual transformation through pain and suffering – we see a glimpse of the early Nietzschean-socialist Orage, taken as a whole the articles on drama are more representative of Orage's post-1910 shift to a quietistic, corporatist approach and are part of a brief collaboration that occurred between Orage and the drama critic, Huntly Carter, between 1911 and 1912, in which the two men between them developed a theory of 'new Classicism' in drama (Carter, 'Russian' 210).¹⁰ As Wallace Martin observes in relation to this phase of the *New Age* as a whole, the term 'neo-medieval' seems more appropriate than the more commonly used 'neo-classical' to refer to its ideas (197–8).¹¹ Although Beasley argues that 'Carter's aesthetic philosophy was far more appropriate to the *Freenwoman* than the *New Age*' (86), his 'Letters from Abroad' (July-

9 For a reading of *King Lear* as an anticipation of expressionism, see Furness, 6.

10 For the post-1910 shift in Orage's thinking, see Chapter 1, pp. 41–2. Orage's notion of a new 'classical' drama may well have been influenced by G. K. Chesterton's Roman Catholic friend, Hilaire Belloc, who in February 1912 had addressed the Playgoers Society of the Leeds Arts Club on the subject of 'The Classical Drama'. In his lecture, Belloc demanded a drama that offered the external order of the 'classical spirit ... to complete what was lacking in man' (Steele 187).

11 Given his attack on 'the present vogue for neo-medievalism' as 'a dangerous narcotic' in his very first contribution to the *New Age* and his enlightened views on women, it would appear to be no coincidence that Dukes left the journal in May 1911, the very same month that Orage and Carter began their collaboration and in which Orage declared his belief that man was 'a fixed species' (Dukes, 'Pomp').

October 1911) certainly reveal a *New Age* penchant for medievalism. Indeed, in his letter from Munich he argues that in the new classical drama, '[t]he artistic spirit of the Middle Ages has been carried across the footlights' ('Meistersingers' 392), while the essentially reactionary nature of his politics is suggested by his argument in his letter from Bayreuth that 'there is a line of continuity underlying life which has bound all Eves together ever since the world began' ('Static' 345).

Orage and Carter's collaboration on a new theory of drama in the *New Age* begins with Carter's article, 'The "Blue Bird" and Bergson in Paris', in which the author welcomes the invasion of the theatre by the Post-Impressionists and appears to co-opt them for the purposes of Guild Socialism, arguing that they 'are working in complete harmony with a system that exhibits ... *a great trust of corporate life*' (italics added, 44).¹² In the following number, Orage writes his 'Unedited Opinions: On Drama' in which he pointedly praises Carter for teaching the truth that 'the stage must be looked upon as the holy place' and goes on to make a provocative analogy between drama and the Mass (58). The week after that, Orage's crucial declaration of his new, anti-progressivist sympathies and his belief that 'man is a fixed species' is published in 'Unedited Opinions: The End of Man' (84). On 1 June 1911, in an article entitled 'The Rebuilding of the Theatre: The New Vision', Carter begins by citing Orage's 'On Drama' approvingly, before going on to advocate a drama paradoxically combining 'the strenuous assertion of vital personality with a recognition that man is *governed* by hereditary tendencies, sub-consciousness and mysticism' (italics added, 113). Between July and October of the same year, Carter goes on to write his 'Letters from Abroad' on experimental European theatre. Finally, on 15 February 1912, Orage returns to the subject in 'On Action in Drama', in which he again praises Carter, this time for being the only critic to understand the importance of stage-craft to the creation of symbolist drama, and advocates the model of the theatre-in-the-round as enabling what is happening

12 Carter had previously written a series of articles for the *New Age* on the Arts and Crafts movement and he went on to extol the Guild system in 'Meistersingers'.

on the stage more readily to become ‘the sub-conscious mind of the audience made visible’ (372).

While accepting Carter’s Bergsonian emphasis on rhythm and unity as criteria for aesthetic value in drama and agreeing, rather grudgingly, with his praise for recent innovations in stage-craft in *Modern Drama*, Jameson has profound reservations regarding the reactionary ideology underlying both his and Orage’s theory of a ‘new Classicism’ in drama. She expresses these reservations by ‘writing back’ to two key aspects of that theory, namely its quietism and its corporatism. Firstly, Jameson picks up on Carter’s association of William Blake’s symbolism with that of the playwright Maeterlinck in his article ‘Art’ (April 1911), turning it against him and insisting that Blake’s transcendentalism is ‘of less inherent value *to drama*’ which ‘is born from the movements of Becoming’ not from an atemporal condition of ‘Being’ (italics added, *MDE* 200). Secondly, Jameson takes issue with Carter’s assertion of a genealogical line leading from Greek tragedy through Shakespeare to the Russian ballets that Diaghelev had recently brought to London (‘Russian’ 210), arguing that the classical model of drama is no longer appropriate in modern times (*MDE* 275). Her reasons here are both anti-foundational and political. On the one hand, she argues that ‘the long-cherished classical belief in an ultimate Reconciliation’ belongs to a ‘region of the Ideal’ no longer credible to a modern mind that ‘surveys the universe and finds it anything but friendly. There are no longer interested gods on Olympus’ (*MDE* 275–6).¹³ At the same time, countering the anti-progressive quietism of both Carter and Orage, she argues for the importance of human agency: ‘Modern thought, releasing man from the weight of heredity and his own past, has reminded him that he lives to direct life’ (277). It is the purpose of modern tragedy, she adds, to inspire the audience to do just that:

In the ancient dramas, kings fell, but the crash woke no echo outside the palace ... When Henry Trebell dies, ... the ripples of his death widen to the slum and the cottage ... We

13 Jameson may also be thinking of Orage’s ‘Unedited Opinions: on Drama’ here in which he recalls with nostalgia the religious role played by Greek tragedy in the life of ancient Athens.

are not reconciled to the waste of his life, but his thought has lit up the darkness, and his hand has advanced the road a little further. (277)¹⁴

Finally, in a discussion of Russian symbolist drama, Jameson writes back to Carter and Orage's promotion of theatre as a communal spiritual experience, expressing concern that this type of theatre can err on the side of being 'an impertinent invasion of personality' (266). More specifically, where, in 'On Action', Orage advocates the format of the theatre-in-the-round because it encourages the audience to identify with the actors, Jameson criticises Evreinov's psychological Monodrama for the demand it makes of the spectator to 'merge his identity in the identity of the performers' (266). The implication of Jameson's argument is that while it is acceptable – in the Nietzschean-socialist manner – to inspire individual members of a theatre audience to change both themselves and society by means of artistic vision, it is not acceptable to put the critical mind to sleep through a symbolist form of group hypnosis in which 'the I and the not-I' become one (266). The Russian symbolists, Jameson complains, 'have given up the search for an answer' (267). The question of what is a legitimate relationship between Self and Other, or Self and Others – both within an artistic and within a social context – is one to which she would return again and again in her writing of the 1920s.

Anthony Ludovici's 'Hard and Dry' Classicism

A third modernist mode of thought within *Modern Drama* is a 'hard and dry' variety of classicism also promoted within the post-1910 *New Age* (Hulme 66). One possible explanation of why Jameson appears to have approved of *this* variety of classicism – despite its lack of respect for the individuality of the many – is that, unlike Orage and Carter's quietistic 'new Classicism', it shared Nietzschean-socialism's view of Art as a political force capable of bringing about social change. Whereas in the Nietzschean-socialist strand of her argument, Jameson – following Dukes – places a higher value on the individual dramatist's

14 Henry Trebell is the fallen reforming politician in H. Granville Barker's banned 1906 play, *Waste*.

expression of personality than on form, however, in this more authoritarian strand, aesthetic form is paramount.

Jameson's source for this variety of classicism is Anthony Ludovici's *Nietzsche and Art* (1911).¹⁵ Ludovici is a figure destined to go down in the history of modernism as the 'light-weight superman' on whom T. E. Hulme threatened to use 'a little personal violence' in a dispute over the work of Jacob Epstein (Hulme 260). As both Rebecca Beasley and Alan Robinson have observed, however, although the two men differed in their estimation of Epstein's work, there were significant parallels between the aesthetic and social theories of each.¹⁶ Influenced by the classicist group, *Action Française*, both men equated aesthetic order with the order that they sought in society and were consequently concerned that artistic expression should not become an individualistic free-for-all. Influenced, too, by the German aestheticians Riegl and Worringer, both men viewed an abstract aesthetic as 'man's only possible way of emancipating himself from the accidental and chaotic character of reality' and consequently admired the austerity, rigidity and geometrical design of ancient Egyptian art among others (Ludovici 107). In addition, although Ludovici *claimed* to embrace change as part of his Nietzschean philosophy, in reality he was as reactionary as the later Hulme, his political ideal being the hierarchical and authoritarian society of ancient Egypt – and, like Hulme, he favoured the use of violence to compel compliance.

In *Modern Drama*, intertextual echoes of Ludovici's authoritarian interpretation of Nietzsche are somewhat bizarrely combined with the anarchistic Nietzschean-socialism that is the dominant note within the text as a whole. This is particularly the case in the more theoretical sections of the text such as the Preface, the Foreword and Chapter 1, in which Jameson discusses the faults of naturalism. In these sections Jameson's quotations from Nietzsche are drawn almost exclusively from the reactionary and 'textually unreliable'

15 There would almost certainly have been a copy of *Nietzsche and Art* in the library at University College (where Jameson first enrolled herself), since the book was originally given as a series of lectures at the college in 1910.

16 See Beasley, 97 and Robinson, 98.

Will to Power, as they are in Ludovici's *Nietzsche and Art* (Robinson 98). In these sections, too, Jameson echoes Part I of Ludovici's first lecture, 'Anarchy in Modern Art', complaining that modern European drama 'is now become a state of anarchy' and arguing for more authoritative cultural standards (*MDE* v–vii). It is notable that Jameson quotes the very same passage from Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* in support of her case as Ludovici does in support of his (*MDE* vii; Ludovici 51). In his second lecture, Ludovici equates aesthetic realism with both democracy and modern science as 'chaotic' and 'bewildering', and sees the artist not as a Dionysian revolutionary, but as an authoritarian genius whose job it is to create the illusion of order in his work (67). Similarly, in her Foreword and Chapter 1, Jameson equates naturalism with both 'the scientific and the social philosophy of the day' as 'disordered and disunifying' and – in a risk-averse manner that runs entirely counter to the rebel faith of Nietzschean-socialism – emphasizes society's need for the artist to 'bring order out of disorder' in order to allay '*confusion and dread of the unknown*' (italics added, xxii, 13, 15). In making the latter point, Jameson again chooses the same quotation from Arnold that Ludovici has chosen in making his argument (*MDE* 13; Ludovici 62). In addition she again quotes the very same words that Ludovici has quoted from Nietzsche's *Will to Power*, namely, 'Artists should not see things as they are – they should see them fuller, simpler, stronger' (*MDE* xxv; Ludovici 90). It is notable, however, that whereas Ludovici's ideal of aesthetic simplicity and power is the static and semi-abstract dynastic statues of ancient Egypt, Jameson's ideal combination of 'power and beauty' in the context of modern European drama is to be found in the more fluid 'constructive art' of Ibsen's drama of 'spiritual change' (*MDE* 75, 80). Nevertheless, it is also relevant in this context to note the aesthetic preference of Margaret – the semi-autobiographical heroine of Jameson's novel, *The Happy Highways* – for the Egyptian sculpture at the British Museum and her praise for its use of 'line' and its (Hulmean) representation of 'the eternal verities' (140, 185).

At this historical distance it may seem strange that Jameson should combine such opposing ‘romantic’ and ‘classical’ approaches in a single text without apparently even noticing the contradictions. It is worth bearing in mind, however, Dan Stone’s observation that Ludovici’s proto-Nazi views ‘chimed with those being espoused by people *on the left as well as the right*, certainly before 1914, and even until 1939’ (34).¹⁷ The ambiguity that is always there in Nietzsche was only compounded in Nietzschean-socialism, and it proved remarkably easy for a number of early Nietzschean-socialists such as Arthur Penty, Allen Upward and Ramiro de Maetzu, to lose their patience with the masses and slip into authoritarianism. In the early sections of *Modern Drama*, Jameson is not immune from this tendency, echoing Nietzsche and Ludovici’s association of democracy and the masses with effeminacy and hysteria, while Ludovici’s view that ‘every artist worthy the name is at heart a despot’ becomes, in Jameson’s somewhat milder version, ‘the great dramatist is ... a man in authority’ (Ludovici 45; *MDE* 65). It is in these sections, too, that in contrast to Dukes’s emphasis on the ‘Theatre Libre’ or ‘Freie Buhne,’ we find a vocabulary of coercion – ‘master’, ‘stamp’, ‘subdue’, ‘impose’ (xxii, xxv, 3, 24). This authoritarian tendency also seeps at times into the main body of the text, so that although (mercifully) Jameson does not go quite as far as Ludovici in advocating the self-immolation of the ‘many-too-many’ (Ludovici 138), in her discussion of Ibsen’s *The Master Builder* it comes as a shock to find her contemplating the Darwinian demise of the weakest with some satisfaction: ‘In his heart (Solness) is glad to die, as are all who recognise both their own uselessness and the beauty of the new life’ (92). Yet Jameson’s later cultural criticism would profit by this youthful impatience with the average man, allowing her to understand from the inside the very real authoritarian potential within modernism.

17 See also Lee Garver’s view that ‘late Edwardian English politics facilitated surprising rhetorical collusions and alliances’ (134).

Edward Carpenter's Mystical Evolutionary Socialism

The fourth and final strand of (proto-)modernist thought in *Modern Drama* is that of Edward Carpenter, one of the most genuinely egalitarian influences on Alfred Orage and the early *New Age*, and a radical political and cultural influence within both the fin-de-siècle and the pre-war period in general. Jameson had previously written back to Carpenter's *Art of Creation* (1904) in the early days of the *Gryphon* at Leeds, arguing against its mystical utopianism.¹⁸ Yet now, when she has criticized the reactionary mysticism of post-1910 *New Age* symbolist drama, she goes on – in the final pages of her thesis – to insist that ‘the finest drama is of necessity a symbolic drama’ and to sketch out a drama of the future that is very much along the lines of Carpenter's text (278). The symbolism of Jameson's drama of the future differs crucially from Orage and Carter's ‘new Classicism’, however, in embodying the all-important notions of human agency and political progress.

In *The Art of Creation*, as mentioned earlier, Carpenter develops a mystical version of Lamarckian biology, which allows for the spiritual progress of one generation to be handed down to the next. He locates the motivating myths or symbols of the ‘race-life’ ‘deep down in the very structure and physical organization of humanity, and in its very physiology’ but also argues that the individual is not trapped in his heredity, having ‘an access and appeal to a region and powers beyond ... all heredity’ that allows him to create new myths or symbols to replace the old and to hand these down, in turn, to his descendents (134, 156). In addition, Carpenter argues that, through this process, myths or dreams that originate within the mind gradually become realized within the physical world. He also recognizes the role played by the intuition of the artist in inspiring the race to move forward beyond its heredity:

We only become conscious of [these myths] in those moments of ... exaltation which take us into *the deeper regions of our being* ... And so it becomes the function of the inspired prophets, poets, artists, to give these a definite form and name ... The many, when they see these forms bodied forth by the great Seers, leap to them and accept them, feeling

18 See Chapter 1, pp. 45–6.

distinctly enough that they answer to *something slumbering within them*. (italics added, 156, 162–3)

Similarly in the conclusion to *Modern Drama*, Jameson argues that ‘beyond the harassing pressure of the day’s needs lies an ideal future of the race to which – unconsciously – we strive’ and that ‘if we have guessed at it at all ... it is only as a vision – a symbol – half caught *in some ill-explored region of the mind*’ (italics added, 278–9). She goes on to argue that ‘as we dream today, men will live tomorrow’ and – echoing Carpenter closely – that ‘tomorrow *sleeps in each man’s* brain’ (not only in that of the Nietzschean-socialist hero) (italics added, 279). Finally, she argues, like Carpenter, that it is the role of the artist – or, more specifically, the dramatist – to arouse people’s interest in their latent biological and spiritual potential:

In this lies the supreme value and power of the drama. It can create interest in ... the undeveloped powers of man ... It can quicken into life the realities that wait beyond and above the confusion of the day ... It can make move before [men’s eyes] the dreams that lie hidden in his thought. ... Man’s mind sends out groping tendrils into the unseen future ... It is for the drama to see that these tendrils ... find something upon which they can fasten. (279)

Despite his very different politics, the open and exploratory nature of Carpenter’s organicism is something that he shared with Nietzsche at his most radical, although not as interpreted by Ludovici. On the other hand, the Nietzschean Ludovici shared the post-1910 Orage’s reactionary evolutionism in which ‘to go backwards is to go forward’ (Orage, qtd. in Gibbons 7). And thus it is possible to discern both the links and the slippages in meaning that contributed to the extraordinary ideological ferment that characterizes not only Jameson’s M.A. thesis, but also the pre-war age in which it was produced. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that all these shifting ideological positions had one important characteristic in common, namely, their faith in the central role of the Artist in effecting social and political change.

Jameson's Attitude to Women

Finally, Jameson's *Modern Drama* provides an unambiguous clue as to her views on the 'Woman Question' immediately before the Great War. Here Jameson draws on both the early and the later *New Age*, although in the absence of any detailed critical study of attitudes to women in the journal (and indeed a conspicuous silence on the part of many commentators) it is difficult to be precise about the trajectory of its changing views.¹⁹ It would seem a fair summary, however, to say that there was a gradual shift from support for the Suffragettes to a Nietzschean-socialist denigration of the 'Other Woman' or middle-class feminist, to an attack on *all* women – eventually including that *New Age* stalwart, Beatrice Hastings, herself.²⁰ In the course of the journal's shift towards a more complete misogyny, a number of favourite variations on its anti-feminist theme emerge. Woman's enemy is not Man but a capitalist system that enslaves men and women alike, therefore socialism should take priority over feminism.²¹ Women are less evolved than men, therefore self-development must *precede* the fight for the vote.²² Alternatively, women are innately inferior to men and therefore would-be intellectually advanced women are on a hiding to nothing and can only 'vampirise [intellectual men], spin off their energy' (Hastings, 'Feminism' 439). As a concomitant of the latter variation, the vast increase in the number of women with intellectual pretensions threatens to decrease the population to the

19 For the best accounts of the *NA*'s increasing misogyny, see R. Allen and Rentfrow, as mentioned in Ch.1. There is also Ardis, 'Debating'. However, although Ardis uses her extremely small selection of articles to make a valid point about Hastings's use of pseudonyms to ventriloquize debate around feminism in the *NA*, she sidesteps the chronological deterioration in Hastings's attitudes towards women and fails to mention the fact that much of what she wrote would make uncomfortable reading for almost any variety of feminist. Similarly, according to Scholes, 'in his zeal to promote her as a feminist, [Hastings's biographer, Stephen] Gray conceals the fact that she was a powerful voice arguing against suffrage' ('Hastings').

20 For an early example of the notion of 'the Other Woman', see the eponymous article by Hastings writing as 'A Reluctant Suffragette'; Hastings, *Woman's*; and Orage's 'Unedited Opinions' in the first three issues of the *New Age* for December 1910. Hastings left Orage and London for Paris in 1914 but continued to contribute to the *New Age*, writing the less politically engaged 'Impressions from Paris' as 'Alice Morning'. It is not clear whether she was fleeing Orage's increasing misogyny or whether Orage became more misogynistic as their relationship deteriorated.

21 See, for example, Orage's 'Notes', 29 Aug. 1912.

22 In his 'Notes' for 30 Nov. 1911, for example, Orage sees feminism as 'preparing women to exercise the vote' (100).

point of 'race suicide' (AER 480). Suffragette militancy is also increasingly pathologised as a manifestation of hysteria or mental imbalance to which women are biologically prone.²³

In his review of Jameson's *Modern Drama*, Austin Harrison suggests the descent of her views on women from the *New Age* when he unconsciously echoes the title of Hastings's controversial pamphlet, *Women's Worst Enemy: Women*, in remarking that '[Jameson's] enemy is no longer man, it is and will be her own sex' (62). Jameson's discussions of the work of Ibsen and Strindberg, in particular, express all the Nietzschean-feminist and anti-feminist variations mentioned above. In her reading of *A Doll's House*, Jameson argues that Nora lacks the Nietzschean 'capacity and effort for freedom' that 'can survive criticism and draw strength from opposition' (95). Furthermore, she sees both Nora and Hedda Gabler as modern parasitic wives who want it both ways, avoiding responsibility yet demanding 'to be judged by no code but [their] own. Very like the average feminist!' (95). Unsurprisingly, given the virulence of her *New Age* anti-feminism, Jameson also diagnoses *both* women as suffering from hysteria. Finally, to clinch this *New Age* profile, in walking out of the doll's house, Nora is seen as possibly endangering 'the future of the race' and as foolishly walking into an alternative trap, namely industrial servitude: 'Let us understand clearly that woman is no slave to man, but, like him, enslaved by a system that on the whole has benefited her' (95–6). With some consistency, the only one of Ibsen's female characters to be seen as possessing admirable strength of personality, at least at the outset of the play, is the socialist Rebecca West in *Rosmersholm*.

As was the case with Beatrice Hastings's early Nietzschean-socialism, Jameson's discussion of Ibsen allows room for a belief in the occasional exceptional woman such as Rebecca West and in the possibility of women's intellectual evolution: 'Whatever women may become in the future (and their development will probably be stupendous) their present intellectual development is on average below that of men. Their claim to equality requires reducing to a demand for forbearance of their efforts' (133). However, her

23 See, for example, Orage's 'Notes', 27 Feb. 1913.

discussion of Strindberg reveals an even more disturbing degree of misogynistic self-hatred, betraying the lasting psychological impact on Jameson of her dominating mother alongside the influence of both the later *New Age* and the Harlands' 'light-hearted' denigration of her as a woman. Strindberg's plays about dysfunctional marriages, *The Father* and *The Dance of Death*, in particular, appear to trigger Jameson's memories of the conflict between her own parents, predisposing her – in her empathy for her excluded father – in favour of Strindberg's misogynistic position (41–5, 57–61). She summarizes Strindberg's notion of the vampire woman approvingly as follows:

The domination of woman is possible only over the weakness of man. If a woman possess strength of intellect, only fineness of soul hinders her desire for dominion. Few such women can brook the taking of equality from the hands of a man, strongly and finely masculine. ... Their love is given most readily to masculine weakness ... They must have weakness to prove to themselves their own power. (45)

Given Jameson's fear of re-enacting her mother's role, one can well imagine the 'frenzy' into which she was driven by Oswald Harland's discovery in her of 'all the traits of [Strindberg's] vampire woman' (*HH* 99)!²⁴

Conclusion

This chapter has drawn attention to the exemplary role of drama within modernist practice and has suggested how the young Jameson's interest in it places her at the forefront of the pre-war avant-garde. It has also shown how her pre-war M.A. thesis combines a range of (often contradictory) incipient intellectual and political trends within modernism and has argued that, in so doing, it typifies the manner in which a mystically-inclined pre-war utopianism could accommodate the opposing polarities of romanticism and classicism, egalitarianism and elitism, inspiration and coercion, like Carpenter's 'many-coloured streams' that lead down to the unifying sea of Democracy (*Towards* 22). In its analysis of her intertextual critique of the anti-progressive, corporatist nature of Orage and Carter's

24 My autobiographical reading of the quoted episode from *The Happy Highways* is based on close parallels between it and a very similar episode described in Jameson's autobiography *No Time* (67).

‘new Classicism’, this chapter has also indicated where Jameson drew the line both stylistically and ideologically, and, in particular, her requirement that Art must help bring about political change. It has also highlighted her rejection of ‘photographic’ naturalism and her movement towards an expressionist drama which conveys the power of unconscious forces without entirely losing touch with dramatic realism. Finally, this chapter has looked at Jameson’s pre-war attitude to women as revealed in *Modern Drama* and has found that her self-punishing negativity towards her own sex not only echoes the misogyny of the *New Age*, but also reaches back to a deeper psychological fear of becoming like her own violently domineering mother.

Chapter 3

‘Master-architects’: *The Pot Boils* (1919) as a Satire on *New Age* and other Early-modernist Messianisms

‘As if one could ever wipe England’s slate clean! ... I’m not the New Messiah, Thea,’
[ThurLOW] said. (PB 241, 245)

Introduction

As a student in Leeds and London, Jameson had enjoyed a life of unusual freedom for a young woman of her day. However, when she married her student-lover, Charles D. Clarke, in the summer of 1913, she set up the conditions for a gradual closing of the trap of convention and biology and thus made her ‘first crippling choice’ (JNI 73). Following the completion of Jameson’s M.A. in April 1914, the young couple lived in a cheap hotel in Kettering where Clarke was teaching. Here, in dingy and depressing surroundings and deprived of intellectually stimulating employment, Jameson at least had the leisure to read prized volumes ordered from the Times Book Club and could thus temporarily regain something of her lost freedom. In less than a year, following a move to Liverpool, this last luxury disappeared as she became the ‘servant’ of a small rented house, ‘scrubbing, cooking, washing up, shopping’, and when her unplanned child, Charles William Storm Clarke, was born in June 1915, the trap appeared to have closed for good (CJ 317). Aggravating the effects of boredom and frustration were poverty and the physical and psychological abuse Jameson suffered at the hands of a weakly conventional husband reluctantly re-enacting the behaviour of his own deeply misogynistic father. Faced with these new circumstances, she changed ‘as helplessly as a tadpole’ and began to re-evaluate ‘the mad hopes, the idealism, the messianic dream’ of her student Nietzschean-socialism from a more egalitarian and materialist perspective (JNI 82, 115). The first fruits of this re-evaluation took the form of *The Pot Boils*, a novel that is an intertextual critique of her own pre-war past in fiction. In it Jameson draws not only on her own beliefs as a student, but

also on her wider textual knowledge of early modernist debate as revealed in Chapter 2. References to more recent intertexts also suggest the degree to which Jameson was keeping up-to-date with new cultural developments. The novel was begun as soon as she arrived in Kettering and completed following the birth of her son, in the spring of 1916.

Through its exploration of the intertextuality of *The Pot Boils*, this chapter reveals Jameson's shrewd analysis of certain messianic tendencies within Orage's *New Age* and Marsden's *New Freewoman* and *Egoist*. It argues that the novel's two main male characters are based on iconic personalities associated with these journals and that they represent opposing messianic extremes within early modernism, namely a 'romantic' tendency towards neo-platonic idealism, theory and egalitarianism, on the one hand, and a more 'classical' tendency towards anti-foundationalism, praxis and a Nietzschean Will-to-Power, on the other.¹ It analyses how Jameson exposes each extreme as absurd and incomplete, firstly, by setting the one against the other and, secondly, by setting both against the unglamorous nature of economic reality and the more admirably practical socialism of her old Leeds professors. This chapter also reads the novel's main female character as a semi-autobiographical version of her author. It interprets this character's struggle with the misogyny of *New Age* Nietzschean-socialism and her eventual liberation from it, as a version of Jameson's own painful return to the socialist feminism she had adopted as a member of the Women's Discussion Society at Leeds. Finally, it explores Jameson's presentation of the aesthetic and political pragmatism of H. G. Wells as a more satisfactory alternative to both the forms of modernist messianism that her novel has found wanting.

The Pot Boils

Jameson wrote more about *The Pot Boils* and the difficult circumstances in which it was written than about any of her subsequent work, and in all her assessments of this first

¹ Jameson's distinction between these two extremes is similar to, though not identical with, Roger Griffin's distinction between 'epiphanic' and 'programmatic' types of modernism respectively (62). It is the latter form of modernism that Griffin sees as containing proto-fascist tendencies.

novel she never ceased to feel that it was ‘an unbelievably bad book’ with ‘no theme, only a riot of scenes and emotions’ and characters who were nothing more than ‘embodied ideas’ (*CJ* 316, 323; *JNI* 84). Looking back with the wisdom of old age, however, she was better able to appreciate the positive qualities within this intellectual ferment: ‘the energy, the delighted playing with ideas and phrases, the irreverence, the reckless gaiety and enthusiasm’ (*JNI* 84). And, indeed, despite its carnivalesque disorder, the novel does have a theme, namely the deflation of the messianic pretensions of both ‘new age’ political visionaries and modernist artists to ‘make it new’.

The Pot Boils follows a group of radical students as they move from an unnamed northern university to London and the world of work. The students initially envisage their role – in grandiose Nietzschean-socialist fashion – as that of ‘master-architects’ of a ‘new age’, whose superior intuitional abilities allow them ‘prevision of the future’ but, as mentioned in the Introduction, the novel’s original title, *The Pot Boils and the Scum Rises*, suggests the manner in which the more messy material realities of life emerge to challenge their messianism (*PB* 18). The specific roles that the two main male characters, Thurlow and Denarbon, see themselves as fulfilling – that of the super-philosopher and the super-artist respectively – are the two types of leadership role recommended by Orage in his early book, *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism*. As a Nietzschean-socialist woman, on the other hand, the main female character, Athenais, has no glamorous messianic role to fulfil. Thurlow, a would-be ‘super-pamphleteer’ as well as a would-be ‘super-philosopher’, represents the more mystical side of the *New Age*’s well-known editor, Alfred Orage, at both the early Nietzschean-socialist and the later Guild-Socialist stages of his career (*PB* 7). Informing both these stages is a transcendental idealism and a concern with social unity that is organicist and empathetic. Denarbon, on the other hand, while predominantly suggestive of Ezra Pound, is a composite character representing aspects of Pound’s friends, T. E. Hulme and Wyndham Lewis, and even of their purported enemy, the less iconic Anthony Ludovici. Consistent with the generic characteristics of this group, he is anti-

humanist, coercive and misogynistic and is broadly influenced by Nietzsche.² He also shares the anarcho-modernist aesthetic of both Pound and Pound's editor at the *Egoist*, Dora Marsden. As mentioned earlier, Athenais is a fictional version of the young Jameson herself.

In Book I of *The Pot Boils*, 'The Northern University', the student Thurlow imagines himself becoming, like Orage, a political journalist 'clever enough to see through lawyer and financier ... strong and subtle enough to defeat [the new plutocrats] by crying abroad the horror of the new slavery' (7). His youthful socialism is gently anarchistic like that of the early Orage and of his mentor, Edward Carpenter, for he believes that 'the whole idea of government from above is wrong' (PB 24). It is also characterized by a Dionysian inclusiveness:

'Wherever a mind is active, whether for Fabian reform or Socialism or Autocracy, for beauty of form and colour, for rebellion and strife, there is the same deep confused prompting – the world is struggling to be free along a thousand dim paths.' (PB 27)³

Like both Orage and Carpenter, Thurlow imagines a transcendental form of communication beyond words and believes that there is a 'lost key' to the meaning of life that, if found, would unlock the door to utopia for humanity (PB 26–7).⁴ Like Orage, too, he despises the Fabians as represented by the fact-obsessed student-Fabian, Weston, who 'wanted to clear roads for [the poor]' rather than 'give them picks and shovels and training to clear their own paths' (PB 21).

2 For the closeness of Ludovici's ideological perspective to that of Hulme, see Chapter 2, 67. Jameson is not concerned with the differences that existed within this group, for instance between both Ludovici and Hulme's interest in the artist as representative of the culture's *Weltanschauung* and Pound's interest in the artist as a profoundly unrepresentative figure (Beasley 99). For an interpretation of Denarbone that focuses solely on his resemblance to Pound, see Gerrard, 'Tempestuous'.

3 The final words of the above quotation recall Zarathustra's words, 'There are a thousand paths that have never yet been trodden; a thousand forms of health and hidden islands of life' (Nietzsche, *Zarathustra* 102). Thurlow's speech also captures something of the spirit of Carpenter's 'inter-twining many-coloured streams' (*Towards* 22).

4 For Orage's belief in a 'lost key', see Thatcher, 262; for 'the soul's ... search for a lost secret' in Carpenter, see Delavenay, 50.

In contrast to Thurlow's mystical interpretation of life, Denarbone's perspective is anti-foundationalist and coercive, as mentioned earlier. As a 'new artist', he sees his role as that of Nietzsche's 'Arch-Liar' who 'will make order by the force of his genius', as opposed to the contemporary realist whose work simply mirrors the meaningless disorder of life (*PB* 33). In addition, unlike the egalitarian Thurlow, he is attracted to notions of aristocracy and even autocracy, and is virulently misogynistic, seeing the Women's Movement as getting 'in the way' of a new Renaissance and despising what he sees as the romantic effeminacy of much contemporary Art (*PB* 9).

Jameson gives depth and authority to her characterisation of Denarbone as a 'new sculptor' by making allusion to two sets of contemporary intertexts, firstly, Ludovici's *Nietzsche and Art* (1911), in which sculpture is taken to be the ideal aesthetic medium, and, secondly, recent journalism relating to the controversial 'new sculpture' of Epstein and Gaudier-Brzeska, which appeared in both the *New Age* and the *Egoist* from December 1913 onwards. The latter began with Ludovici's criticism of Epstein's sculpture which provoked T. E. Hulme's notorious reply in 'Mr Epstein and his Critics'.⁵ Wyndham Lewis then joined in the verbal assault on Ludovici, leading to animated debate within the journal's correspondence columns. Gaining favour with Orage, Hulme went on to publish his series on 'Modern Art' in the *New Age*, giving rise to more extensive correspondence within the journal. At the same time, Ezra Pound began a series of articles on the 'new sculpture' in the *Egoist* on the 16 February 1914. Pound's first article in the series, 'The New Sculpture', was published in the same issue as Jameson's second contribution to that journal, and Gaudier Brzeska's letter supporting Pound, in the same issue as her third. She was, therefore, clearly aware of much of the debate and had noted how the new sculpture represented an art of 'forces' (Pound, 'New' 68) and of 'visual severance' (Sherry, *Ezra* 41),

5 For an earlier reference to this dispute, see Chapter 2, p. 67.

as opposed to Orage's aesthetic preference for a numinous and holistic symbolism. She had also noted the shift that occurred in Pound's ideological position at around this time.⁶

In her initial characterization of Denarbone, Jameson offers the informed reader several pointers towards the aforementioned intertexts. Like both Ludovici and Pound, Denarbone cites the work of Rodin disapprovingly as the supreme example of an effeminate romanticism in Art (Pound, 'Vorticism' 277; Ludovici 16; *PB* 8); like Hulme, Pound and Ludovici, he praises Egyptian – as opposed to Greek – Sculpture for its 'hard' classical simplicity (Hulme 252; Pound, 'Gaudier-Brzeska' 380; Ludovici 215ff.; *PB* 33).⁷ Drawing on Ludovici's Nietzschean use of the sculptor's clay as a metaphor for a formless world to be moulded by the human Will, Jameson has Denarbone struggle to give Apollonian shape to the Dionysian 'formlessness' of *his* clay (Ludovici 66–7; *PB* 29).⁸ Above all, Denarbone's sculpture suggests 'the modernist urge towards dynamic embodiment' (Kadlec 2) or what Pound describes as 'energy cut into stone' ('Gaudier-Brzeska' 382), an aesthetic influenced, perhaps, by Marsden's anarcho-Nietzschean prioritization of 'becoming over being, or of the deed over the doer' (Kadlec 114).⁹ Both Denarbone's initial plan to sculpt 'a great bronze "Strife"' and his later model of an athlete – with 'straining muscles' producing a 'sense of restrained power' – suggest a similar preference for the energy of action over stasis or mystical contemplation (*PB* 8, 174).¹⁰ The choice of the title 'Strife' also alludes to Pound's representation of the contemporary arts as at war with bourgeois society and in a

6 Levenson and Clarke both see 'The New Sculpture' as representing a pivotal moment in Pound's movement towards anti-humanism (Levenson 75; Clarke 110).

7 For an earlier discussion of Jameson's awareness of Ludovici's admiration for Egyptian art, see Ch. 2, 68. Denarbone also echoes the somewhat arcane anthropological arguments of one of Pound's favourite writers, Allen Upward (*PB* 31). In November 1913, Pound strongly recommended *The Divine Mystery*, Upward's pseudo-anthropological study of the martyred genius, to his readers in the *New Freewoman* ('Divine Mystery') and Jameson went on to read it in Kettering in 1914.

8 See also Hulme's imagist demand that 'each sentence should be a lump, a piece of clay ... a wall touched with soft fingers', and the 'struggle' and 'tension' that he associates with the artist working to bend his material to his will (25, 69).

9 There is considerable critical debate as to who was the predominant influence in the partnership between Pound and Marsden. See Moody, 227; Clarke, 110; and Kadlec, 58–60.

10 Jameson may well have been thinking of such art works as Bomberg's 'The Acrobats', mentioned by Hulme in 'Modern Art III' (662); de Segonzac's 'Les Boxeurs' published in the *New Age* in 1912; or Gaudier-Brzeska's 'Wrestler', exhibited in a show at the Albert Hall in the summer of 1913.

condition of 'strife' and his warning that 'those artists, so called, whose work does not show this strife, are uninteresting' ('New' 68). This attitude would lead Pound to combine with Wyndham Lewis to produce *Blast*, a short-lived but sensationably avant-garde little magazine that Jameson would parody in her second novel, *The Happy Highways*.

Finally, there is the peripheral figure of Athenais. Although, at this point in the novel, she goes along with Thurlow's ideas, 'half unconsciously ... adapt[ing] herself to his thoughts with a docility that deceive[s] him', she is, in fact, 'too obstinate to be influenced overmuch' and is privately 'forming standards of criticism' of her own, which she 'dare[s] not' as yet 'produce ... in the light of day' (PB 37–8). Her fear of criticizing not only Thurlow but also his friend Denarbon is unsurprising given the uneasiness surrounding the 'Woman Question', for if 'the men who spoke [on it] affected an enthusiasm or a violent misogyny which they did not feel', the choice for the women themselves is either to be silent or to be 'voluble and arrogant' (PB 23). Choosing a dignified silence, Athenais is dissociated from all the crimes of which the post-1910 *New Age* accused women: her mind is not imitative but independent and therefore 'curiously masculine in most respects' and, while sexually liberated, she is anything but obsessed with sex, regarding her relationship with Thurlow 'unconcernedly' as 'part of an absurd adventure' (PB 24, 48, 51).¹¹ Like Beatrice Hastings in the *New Age* (and Jameson as an M.A. student in London), Athenais thus sees herself as the exception that proves the rule, studying her female contemporaries 'much as the young Achilles, in his girl's clothes, may have studied the thoughts and habits of his unwitting companions' and treating them with 'half-unconscious contempt' (PB 47–8). Unlike her male friends, however, she is unclear about her role in the coming 'new age'.

Setting up an economic-materialist perspective within the text, a warning is issued to the students before they leave university by a professor with a generic resemblance to Jameson's politically committed, down-to-earth university professors at Leeds and with the

11 On the imitative nature of women's mind, see, for example, Schnitz; and on women's obsession with 'sex-feeling', see Hastings's series of letters on 'The Black Peril'. For an earlier discussion of *New Age* attitudes to women, see the final section of Chapter 2.

supremely anti-Nietzschean name of Brebis (French for ‘sheep’). Responding to Thurlow’s arrogant complacency, Brebis explains:

Your college may be set in a filthy industrial city, and not in the dusty quiet of Oxford, but don’t deceive yourself into supposing that by virtue of such an accident you are any the nearer life. You may be nearer the recognized type of young intellectual. That is just what you are – intellectuals, full of ideas and high resolves. (PB 44–5)

Brebis’s practical socialist concern is based on a Marxist analysis of the contemporary situation for which the Professor of Economics at Leeds, David MacGregor, is a probable source:

Wealth is growing quicker than population. So that someone is getting richer. It’s not the poor man, for he is breeding faster than wages are increasing, and all the time the cost of living grows. So that the rich get richer, the poor poorer. A hell-deep gulf ahead. (PB 45)

Perceiving the hopelessly impractical nature of the students’ resolves, Brebis challenges them to make an active commitment to the working-class struggle: ‘Your choice must be made. On which side in the coming struggle will your vaunted intellect be found?’ (PB 45–6). But once the students reach London, Brebis’s worst fears regarding their lack of genuine political commitment are realized.

Jameson’s account of Thurlow/Orage’s career as he faces the challenges of life in the metropolis is both affectionate and critical, poking gentle fun at the ‘streak of mysticism in his make-up’ that, according to Herbert Read, ‘rendered him ineffectual as a man of action’ and wryly exposing the dependence of his purportedly independent socialist journal on the exploitative production of surplus value (qtd. in Thatcher 262). On the issue of ineffectuality, Jameson has Thurlow trace the same ideological path as had Orage when he arrived in London and became editor of the *New Age*. According to Martin, Orage was involved in a five-year-long examination of ‘the philosophical basis of Socialism’ before he eventually adopted the neo-medievalist policy of Guild Socialism (205). During his first *three* years in London, Thurlow is involved in a similar – although less protracted – examination of ‘the various groups of thinkers and workers who [ar]e trying to change the

social system', but is politically 'irresolute' and lacks any concrete policy of his own (*PB* 116–7, 212). Finally, after Athenais has lost patience with him, Thurlow arrives at a political theory that is Guild Socialism in all but name, a scheme in which the working-classes 'must demand the control of their labours' and the middle-classes the 'control of their professions', 'each body to control its own affairs' 'within proper safeguards, to be fixed by the whole community' (*PB* 161–2).¹²

In critiquing Thurlow/Orage's tendency towards ineffectual theorizing, Jameson draws again on the practical socialist commitment that she had encountered amongst her professors at Leeds. Professor Brebis turns up in London, like a guardian angel, to accuse Thurlow of 'bursting with theories and fat living' and remind him of his socialist duty (*PB* 210). Jameson also draws on Marsden's attacks on Orage's *New Age* in the *New Freewoman* and the *Egoist*, with their anarcho-modernist emphasis on the superior value of action and the Will. In 'Tales for the Attentive', Marsden replies to the neo-platonism of Orage's misogynistic series, 'Tales for Men Only', with an anarchistic allegory of the conquest of Mind by a vitalist Will; while, in 'Men, Machines and Progress', she argues that the theorising moralism of the *New Age* plays into the hands of the capitalists, who are delighted if socialists can be kept 'busy debating' abstract questions of 'Right' and 'Wrong' rather than taking any action against them (44).¹³ Similarly, in *The Pot Boils*, a Russian anarchist attacks Thurlow's neo-platonism, arguing:

'There is nothing more horribly clear today than the failure of the man who thinks. ... he talks and a few listen to him, a few already convinced ... *In rare instances, he edits a journal ...* Pah – my friends – behold ... the stinking intellectual ... You were to lead men out of the caves: there you sit, still in your little cave, playing with shadows and making great plans while the cunning ruler closes the door of your trap.' (italics added, *PB* 166–7)

In her critique of Orage's ineffectuality, Jameson also draws more specifically on Marsden's anarchistic nominalism which attacked the abstract language of idealism on

¹² For an outline of Guild Socialism, see Chapter 1, pp. 41–2.

¹³ Orage's 'Tales for Men Only' appeared in the *New Age*, Aug. 1911–Nov. 1912. Marsden's 'Tales for the Attentive' appeared in the *New Freewoman*, 1 Oct. 1913.

principle.¹⁴ In 'I AM', Marsden wrote an extended exposé of what she saw as the Verbal Age's fetishisation of language, arguing that abstract language had acquired the solidity of 'body, blood and bone' and that words had become the masters of men (1). Elsewhere Marsden had already given a historical instance of what can happen to those who 'literalize in their persons the abstract ideals of causes' in the demise of Emily Wilding Davison, who was trampled to death during the Derby for 'the Cause of the empty concept' ('Views', 15 June 1913, 3–5). Similarly, Thurlow is accused of becoming 'the servant of the faith [he] reared' and of clothing the skeleton of that faith in his own flesh and blood, 'so that it walked in its own strength and carried him with it' (PB 246). Employing a similar nominalism, Denarbon satirically teases out the likely political reality behind Thurlow's idealistic use of the abstract Guild Socialist concept of 'Community':

'Community – communal – what do you mean? Here's a body for your word: ... the spreading of a communal faith would mean that a few strong ... would tyrannise over the crowd under the pretence of serving the community.' (PB 160)

Finally, as would later happen to Orage himself, Thurlow is forced to face the fact that even his most thoroughly worked-out political theory is anything but solid, lacking 'mortar' and having holes in it 'that a man on a galloping horse would see' (PB 290).

In tracing the three stages of Thurlow's journalistic career, Jameson has a lot of fun exposing the gulf between Orage's theoretical idealism and the economic reality of publishing the *New Age*. At the same time, she explores the material conditions informing the publication of newspapers and journals in the early twentieth century in general.¹⁵ Initially, Jameson draws attention to the fact that newspapers and journals are the

14 Nominalism was a common intellectual preoccupation during this period. Jameson is likely to have linked Marsden's nominalism with the pragmatic nominalism of H. G. Wells in his essay 'The Skepticism of the Instrument' (see below) and, possibly, with the Bergsonian nominalism of T. E. Hulme (see Chapter 1, p. 54). For Jameson's later interest in the nominalist arguments of William James, see Chapter 4.

15 Jameson would go on to develop her cultural-materialist analysis more specifically in relation to the production of 'high modernism' in *Three Kingdoms* (1926) and *Delicate Monster* (1933). For a cultural materialist reading of *Three Kingdoms*, see Chapter 6, and for a similar reading of *Delicate Monster*, see Armstrong, 51.

ideological mouthpieces of their owners by sending up Remington's Blue Book in H. G. Wells's *The New Machiavelli*.¹⁶ Having gained his first position on the staff of his half-brother's paper, the *Morning News*, by nepotism, Thurlow, like Wells's Remington, hopes to use this official organ of 'the party of Conservative reform' as a platform for his own socialist ideas (PB 71). The news editor complains, however, that Thurlow is 'too intellectual for this paper' and 'ought to be writing ... for the "New Age"' and when one day he offends the paper's conservative backers by following Nietzsche's 'dancing star' and writing what he really thinks, he is moved into the photographic department (PB 70). Moving on to a new job as editor of a journal called the *Beacon*, Thurlow condemns Wells's theory of cross-party co-operation as an unrealistic dream with the words: 'We've got to get away from the "New Machiavelli" and Remington's damnable New Tory Party and his Blue Weekly' (PB 244).

Jameson's account of the *Beacon* is based on extensive coverage of the sacking of Charles Lapworth, the editor of the *Daily Herald*, in the *New Age* between December 1913 and April 1914. The story became a *cause célèbre* in the journal because it was seen as an example of editorial integrity under threat from the forces of commercialism. Initially a militant working-class paper, the *Daily Herald* had come into existence during a printers' strike in the winter of 1910–1911 and had been funded by the workers themselves. In June 1913, however, it had been forced into liquidation and had been rescued by George Lansbury and Lapworth, the shortfall in production costs being guaranteed by Lansbury's wealthy friends. At the heart of this arrangement was an agreement that the paper's new financial backers should have no influence over its editorial policy, but, according to Lapworth, Lansbury was soon attempting to use the *Daily Herald* to further his own political career and to promote the cause of the W.S.P.U. which he supported. When Lapworth fought to retain his editorial independence, he was forced to resign. Following a

16 As John Carey observes, Wells was 'nearly always in two minds' (135). Here Jameson is satirizing the conservative Wells. For Jameson's admiration of Wells in more radical mode, see below.

similar pattern, in *The Pot Boils* Thurlow originally agrees to work for a pittance on the basis that he will be given a reasonably free editorial hand, but ‘the *Beacon* had never paid’ and soon its wealthy feminist backers begin to interfere with his editorial decisions (230). When Thurlow protests that the women’s factionalism is ‘injuring the paper’, pressure is put on him so that, like Lapworth, he resigns (PB 255).

The material cost of Thurlow’s bid to retain his intellectual integrity is explored in a vivid account of the months of semi-starvation he endures whilst editor of the *Beacon*, an account for which Jameson drew upon her own experiences of semi-starvation as an M.A. student in London and then as a young wife and mother. ‘Lines of strain’ appear round Thurlow’s mouth and he becomes prone to attacks of dizziness (PB 232). However, instead of being defeated by economic reality, Thurlow’s idealism is allowed to survive unscathed. No sooner has he resigned from the *Beacon* with the requisite Nietzschean bravado than a *deus ex machina* appears in the form of his friend, the captain of industry John Brinton. Brinton promises to back the debts of a new journal, while granting Thurlow complete editorial control.

Thurlow’s new venture has close parallels with Orage’s real-life journal: its name, the *Iconoclast*, is a direct allusion to Orage’s early Nietzschean-socialist call for ‘adventurous iconoclasts’ to attack established interests, while its funding arrangements recall those of the *New Age* (Nietzsche 157), where Orage was able to rise above ‘the onerous task of securing advertisements’, because the paper’s large annual deficit was met by wealthy benefactors ‘who did not attempt to influence policy’ (Martin 32). Jameson draws attention to the discrepancy between Thurlow/Orage’s idealistic socialist intentions and his collusion with a politically suspect cultural privilege, by comparing him to a ‘peacock’ in his pompousness (PB 264). The reference is to D. H. Lawrence’s *The White Peacock* (1911), a novel about cultural privilege and the class divide, and it is one that recurs elsewhere in

Jameson's work.¹⁷ Jameson also turns Orage's comparison of Man to a goat on a tether against him. When Thurlow/Orage encounters the anarchist Norden as he victoriously escapes from the *Beacon*, he is asked: 'Are you running on a tether?', a question which raises the possibility that he is not the free agent he thinks he is (*PB* 281). Thurlow/Orage's prized political and cultural autonomy is further undermined when Brinton is described as 'play[ing] on an invisible chess board with a wine glass for a pawn' whilst talking to Thurlow about the arrangements for the journal (*PB* 289). In the circumstances, Thurlow's final declaration that he and Athenais will no longer be 'shadows in other men's play' but will direct their own play 'for always and always' appears nothing less than naïve self-delusion (*PB* 305).

Jameson's portrayal of Denarbone's life in pre-war London draws predominantly, though not exclusively, on Ezra Pound's pre-war career and it has two key functions. Firstly, it sets up a dialogue with Marsden's anarcho-modernist critique of linguistic abstraction: if Thurlow/Orage fails to act, bogged down by words, Denarbone's story and related incidents illustrate the opposing dangers associated with Marsden and Pound's co-option of political anarchism for aesthetic purposes. Secondly, Denarbone's story writes back to Pound's assumption that the world owes the artist-messiah a living. Jameson emphasizes the link between political anarchism and aesthetic modernism when a fight between Denarbone and a rival lover incarnates, as it were, one of his own sculptures of 'straining muscles' and 'struggling limbs' (*PB* 174). Watching are two anarchists – a Czech and the very same Russian who criticizes Thurlow for his wordy philosophizing – both of whom take pleasure in the fight as a (Bergsonian) aesthetic spectacle (*PB* 164). Although

17 Ironically, it is extremely likely that Lawrence's notion of the 'white peacock' – which applies particularly to his culturally privileged and hypocritical heroine, Lettie Beardsall – was itself influenced by Hastings's satire on a culturally privileged Other Woman, 'The Whited Sepulchre', a critically acclaimed series that appeared in the *New Age* between April and June 1909. Lawrence was a great admirer of Hastings's work (Gray 161), and in his later novella, 'The Ladybird', the cultivated heroine, Lady Daphne, is compared to a 'whited sepulchre' (*Three* 37). Jameson may well have recognized the influence of the *New Age* behind Lawrence's early depictions of cultivated women. For a discussion of Jameson and Lawrence, see Chapter 5.

they are now friends, only a little earlier these two anarchists were themselves involved in a brawl that almost completely destroyed the lodgings of the English anarchist, Norden.¹⁸ Their erratic, uncontrolled energy thus suggests that their anarchism will be no more effective in achieving *their* political goals than Thurlow's wordy philosophizing has been in achieving *his*. Furthermore, a final tableau in the same scene suggests that the anarchists' openness to man's visceral energies may be playing with fire. As peace is restored and Norden's English friends depart, they look back at a shadow-play enacted on the lit-up blind of Norden's room. The Czech anarchist is flinging his arm round Norden's shoulder, but is the gesture one of love, wonder the onlookers, or is 'the little fiend' attempting to strangle their friend (*PB* 169)?

In another scene, in which Denarbon reacts with 'nervous fury' to a piece of work that turns out badly, Jameson explores the nature of the psychological strain imposed on the anarcho-modernist artist by the Nietzschean task of capturing dynamic life in still form (*PB* 29). In this scene, Jameson may well be thinking of Pound's important article, 'Wyndham Lewis', in which Pound praises Lewis's *Timon of Athens* portfolio for its representations of the 'sullen fury' of the beleaguered artist with whom he also associates himself as a writer (233). The latter article supports Sherry's view that Pound's animus against the times in *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley* was motivated, at least in part, by the sheer difficulty of his own aesthetic aims and his fears of failure (*Ezra* 83). In the scene from *The Pot Boils*, Jameson expresses her prescient concern that the psychological pressures created by the anarcho-modernist preoccupation with moulding energy into form might lead to an extreme swing back towards a more coercive order and the political right. As the frustrated Denarbon angrily 'batter[s] the clay into formless nonentity, he is compared to 'Yaweh repenting his creation of man' (*PB* 29). The metaphorical equivalence of 'man' and 'formless nonentity' here makes explicit the impulse underlying Denarbon's gesture. Furthermore, the

18 As mentioned in Chapter 1, this brawl is based on a real-life fight between Sydney Harland and his landlady's son.

implications of that impulse for women are darkly hinted at soon after, when Denarbone is described as feeling towards a girl-friend who has not come up to his demanding expectations 'as to that silent head when he battered it into meaningless clay' (PB 35).

In the sinister trajectory of Denarbone/Pound's career it becomes clear that his swing to the right is exacerbated by his inflated sense of his own importance as a radical artist.¹⁹ Here Jameson develops ideas she was voicing during the same period in her article for the *Egoist*, 'England's Nest of Singing-Birds', where she criticizes Pound's Imagists for their 'peacock-screaming' arrogance, and demands: 'Is life harsh because a few fifth-rate poets are half-starved in garrets?' (176).²⁰ In *The Pot Boils*, Denarbone refuses to lower his standards to make his work commercially acceptable and when he realizes, finally, that he can't 'scale Parnassus ... on half a meal a day and hope', his initial socialist sympathies give way to an almost paranoid fear of social mobility, and to nostalgia for a more clearly defined social hierarchy in which the privileged artist might pursue his art protected from all economic necessity (PB 276). This process culminates in two hunger-induced hallucinations. In one he sees the Temple of Art destroyed by the masses in the guise of 'dirty little beasts with monstrous heads' who deposit 'heaps of filth' in its ruins (PB 171). The second represents the socially mobile masses flooding over the face of England like 'darkness visible', so that '[a]ll the outlines [are] gone' and 'life, music, art, literature' are all 'slopped over' by their 'beastly silly little lives' (PB 278–9). In the language of these visions Jameson foregrounds images of dirt, low animal life and, above all, fluidity that recall those used by Pound, Ludovici, Hulme and Wyndham Lewis, in their increasingly abject representation of the working-classes.²¹ Finally, shrewdly anticipating Pound's departure from England following his condemnation of a philistine age in *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley*,

19 On Pound's public declaration of his genius in his *New Age* series, 'I Gather the Limbs of Osiris', see Moody, 169. On the change in tone in Pound's contributions to the *New Age* between 1910 and late 1913, from one of 'solicitousness towards a general readership' to one of 'isolated superiority', see Ardis, 'Dialogics', 413. That Jameson had read at least some of Pound's 'Limbs of Osiris' series is suggested by a satirical allusion to it in *The Happy Highways* (223).

20 For an earlier discussion of this article, see Chapter 1, pp. 55–6.

21 On the use of such images, see Fernihough, 'Go in Fear', 485–6, and Carey, 25.

Jameson has Denarbon leave England in disgust. Although Thurlow and Athenais lament Denarbon's departure as England's loss, another (Fabian) character's rumination as to 'whether artists as a whole are worth saving to a State' remains hanging in the air (PB 301).

While the satire of *The Pot Boils* works to deflate the youthful messianisms of both Thurlow and Denarbon, the initially timid Athenais unexpectedly develops clearer (feminist) aspirations towards the end of the novel. When she first arrives in London she defers the problem of what to do with her life by enrolling at the London School of Economics. As her three-year course comes to an end, however, she looks around her for a role that will allow her to contribute to the shaping of a new society. At first there appear to be only two alternative role models for the New Woman – the 'amateur George Sands' and the 'Efficiency Hag' – both of which are derived from *New Age* stereotypes of the 'Other Woman' (TWY 32; PB 191).²² The 'amateur George Sands', Elsa Carey, represents the *New Age's* upper-class feminist parasite who demands rights and privileges without responsibility and who (sometimes) aspires to culture. In her delineation of Elsa, Jameson combines a whole range of *New Age* sources to produce a caricature that almost outdoes the latter journal in its virulent misogyny. Echoing the *New Age* view that artists should not marry (PVC 177–8), Elsa Carey is the shrewish and ungrateful wife of a true literary artist who has prostituted his talent to earn a living for her and their child. *New Age* ridicule of the woman with intellectual and cultural pretensions is reflected in the 'salon' Elsa runs for second-rate artists, in her 'ape-like parade of little learning', and in her imitative attempts at symbolist *vers libre* (PB 98).²³ Her pursuit of sexual excitement and her hysterical physical abuse of her only daughter derive from Hastings's theme of 'the unfit mother' and the post-1910 *New Age's* view that women are biologically prone to hysteria – as well as from Jameson's own experience of abuse as a child.

22 For an earlier discussion of these stereotypes, see the final section of Chapter 2.

23 For a send-up of such women, see Hastings, 'Lady.'

A second (negative) *New Age* role-model for Athenais is the reforming woman who, in the words of Beatrice Hastings, ‘do[es] not in the least want to mother the race, but ... do[es] yearn to manage it’ (‘Race’ 436). The example of this stereotype in *The Pot Boils* is Margaret Destin, President of her own National Committee for Social Reform, who appears to be based on Beatrice Webb. Jameson’s characterization of Destin may well have been influenced by Wells’s far more scabrous portrait of Webb in *The New Machiavelli*, a key text for Jameson; the phrase ‘Mrs. Webb to tea’ in her brief plan for *The Pot Boils* indicates that the character also has its source in a real-life episode when, as secretary of the Women’s Representative Council of the Union at Leeds University, Jameson was one of a group of women students who did indeed have ‘Mrs. Webb to tea’ (CJ 316; ‘University’ 5). The character of Destin contains a number of similarities to the historical Mrs. Webb. Like Webb, Destin turns to reform following disappointment in love and discovers herself to be ‘one of the greatest of living organisers’ (PB 62). Like Webb, she bases her policies on meticulously gathered statistical information and, although she is prepared to cooperate with a range of organisations, she jealously guards her own organisation’s independence from the political fray.²⁴

While Athenais is instinctively repulsed by the blatantly egotistical Elsa Carey, she is far more attracted by Margaret Destin, who, as a friend of her dead mother, takes her under her wing and offers her the possibility of eventually taking over as president of her society. Athenais’s refusal of Destin’s offer is based on two familiar *New Age* criticisms, firstly, that the activities of the Fabian Society/N.C.F.S.R. contribute to the creation of a ‘Servile State’, and, secondly, that most women are closet sadists who are ‘potentially dangerous’ ‘when they feel in positions of power over some living thing’ (Hastings, ‘Reply’ 592), or, in Athenais’s version, that the women who belong to Destin’s society are ‘a thousand itching brains and fingers’, treating the poor as ‘a wretched lay figure’ on which they ‘satisfy their

24 For Webb’s early love for the radical politician Joseph Chamberlain and its sublimation in work for the Fabian Society, see Nord, 96–110.

need to interfere and rule' (PB 126). Destin's name – which combines Jameson's own first name (Margaret) with a surname that is French for 'destiny' – suggests that this character is functioning on a psychological level as Jameson's alter ego, representing her intense, and perhaps debilitating, fear of becoming like her domineering if much loved mother. Given Jameson's own talent for organization, Athenais's feeling of temptation in the face of Destin's offer has an autobiographical ring to it: 'You offer me a royal road to a certain – power. It has tempted me in the past: almost it tempts me now: I am not without ambition' (PB 123).

Fearing to become either 'the Elsa Carey female' or 'the Efficiency Hag', Athenais experiences 'torturing indecision' until she joins the staff of a left-wing newspaper, the *Pioneer*, and encounters half a dozen women strikers (PB 133, 191). By making these women producers of artificial flowers – a product incompatible with the dignity of the male factory worker – Jameson cleverly undercuts Orage's post-1910 argument that female workers deprive working men of jobs to which they have a higher claim given their need to support wives and children. 'Peaked face[d] and underfed', the women have come to collect their 'bits of unearned increment', an inadequate pittance that has been raised to help them survive during the strike (PB 185). Refusing to sacrifice their independence by going into domestic service, and retaining their warmth and good humour in the face of severe economic hardship, these women offer Athenais an alternative role model, namely that of a female socialist heroism at a grass-roots level. The encounter also prompts Athenais/Jameson to give greater attention to the doubly severe material position of 'ill-paid, ill-fed working wom[e]n in England', a position that had been the central concern of Jameson's Women's Discussion Society at Leeds and that was again becoming a concern following the misogynistic phase of *Modern Drama in Europe* (PB 244).

In a meeting with Denarbon shortly after this encounter, Athenais finally feels able to reveal her private criticisms of *New Age* misogyny 'in the light of day'. Following a long

speech by Denarbon echoing Orage's views on working women, Athenais's 'voice harden[s]' and she comes out with a veritable tirade:

It's all very well, ... but I know there is something wrong when ... the only alternative to offices and factories is life in a suburban rabbit-hutch – baking, cleaning, washing, nursing the child, and waiting for the man to come in and be fed ... Goodness knows how I loathe – for differing reasons – both the Elsa Carey female and the Efficiency Hag – but you've got to see ... that not only have they wrought such spiritual changes that the mental outlook of women – and of men on women – will never be the same again, but that they're not alone in making and clamouring for change. Behind them are the thousands – hundreds of thousands of women ... who can ... never be satisfied with the four walls of Nook Rise and Fairview ... You must see that you *can't* shove women back, no matter how you coax or abuse. You'll have to make your plans for a re-made society on the basis of feminine labour alongside masculine. After all – why not?' (PB 191–2)

The novel ends with Athenais entering her marriage to Thurlow on a compromise basis: she plans to 'make a home for him and to take care of him' but she does not intend to 'stop in a wall-papered bandbox', planning instead to continue her career as a journalist, (if only as second fiddle to Thurlow), and to use her journalism to 'get women out of theirs' (PB 298–9). Jameson would wait until her fifth novel, *Three Kingdoms*, to explore the practical difficulties for women juggling domestic commitments with a career.

A Wellsian Pragmatism

As an alternative to both Thurlow's political and Denarbon's artistic messianism, Jameson offers the reader H. G. Wells's philosophical pragmatism. In *Journey*, Jameson recollects how she and her student friends in pre-war London admired Wells 'sincerely and blindly' (along with Orage, Freud and Anatole France), but in the intertexts of both *The Pot Boils* and her next novel, *The Happy Highways*, we find her coming to terms with the contradictory nature of his achievement (JNI 66). In addition to sending up *The New Machiavelli's* conservative pragmatism in the farce of Thurlow's career at the *Morning News*, Jameson also alludes approvingly to Wells's theoretical exposition of his pragmatic philosophy in his early essay 'Scepticism of the Instrument', an essay that Wells himself considered so important that he not only appended it to his *Modern Utopia* (1905) but also

expanded it to form a chapter of *First and Last Things* (1908).²⁵ Seeking to persuade Athenais to change her political approach, Denarbon offers her an allegory of philosophical pragmatism in the form of a sketch of a caveman's crude wall-carving. In the sketch, the caveman-artist is 'crouched on the ground beside the wall of a cave' bearing 'a clumsy tool' in his hand but with no sign of the higher spiritual reality that Plato had imagined behind him. Offering a gloss on his sketch, Denarbon wonders what would have happened had the primitive sculptor 'thrown his tools down in despair' and recommends Athenais to use the 'old tools' which, though 'sadly imperfect', cut (*PB* 138–9). Denarbon's recommendation is an allusion to the knife imagery used by Wells in his essay to illustrate the difference between truth and utility. In 'Scepticism', Wells points out that 'what we call stable and solid' is, at a molecular level, 'a freely moving system of interlacing centres of force', and goes on to argue that although we now know that 'there is neither knife to cut, scale to weigh, nor eye to see', we still continue to think in terms of the old linguistic categories because they are practically useful to us (*Modern* 388–9). Thus, like the pragmatist philosopher William James, Wells shares anarcho-modernism's recognition of the mismatch between static linguistic categories and the fluidity of material life; but instead of its radical new aesthetic forms, he argues for an approximate and provisional use of existing language.

When Athenais follows Denarbon's advice and goes to work for the *Pioneer*, a left-wing example of political pragmatism is introduced into the novel. The behaviour of the *Pioneer*'s editor, Hartley, provides a direct contrast to Thurlow's purist approach to political journalism. Although his journal 'has the last legs of a centipede' and he must 'waste a good deal of [his] time seeing [its] creditors', Hartley contrives to 'keep off [his backers'] prejudices and still write honestly' (*PB* 183). His combination of devious energy and sheer unglamorous pragmatism is comically symbolized by the grotesque wandering eye with which he distracts unwary middle-class backers seeking to influence his editorial policy.

25 On Wells's admiration for James, see Introduction, p. 19, n. 29.

Unlike the messianic Thurlow, Hartley's political role is that of a modest facilitator providing accurate information regarding the incidence of poverty and injustice, and painfully garnering funds with which to support the strikes of grass-roots activists. His model of political change is not utopian but modestly accretive, its bloody-minded tenacity suggested by his comparison of the *Pioneer* to 'a little engine, trying to pull an excursion train up the Matterhorn' (PB 243). Yet while the more ambitious Thurlow only deludes himself, significant if small-scale work *is* being done at the office of the *Pioneer*.

Although Denarbone does not appear to recognize that the Wellsian pragmatism he preaches may apply to the realm of aesthetics, Jameson's novel itself is a perfect example of aesthetic pragmatism. Indeed, in its 'riot of scenes and emotions' and its 'embodied ideas', *The Pot Boils* comes down firmly on the side of Wells in the well-publicized dispute between Henry James and Orage as aesthetic purists, on the one hand, and Wells as aesthetic pragmatist and critic of modernity, on the other, a dispute that took place in the *New Age* and elsewhere between 1911 and 1915.²⁶ Drawn with 'that slight falsification, that touch of the grotesque' that Jameson would continue to see as a central component of the novel form right up to the end of her career, the character of Poskett, in particular, epitomizes a socially engaged literary pragmatism in the tradition of Wells and Dickens (Jameson, Foreword vi). A commercial traveller with a Board School education, Poskett lives in the room next to Thurlow's when the latter is at his poorest whilst working for the *Beacon*. He is closest in character and circumstances to Mr. Polly, the Wells character whom Jameson was praising in the *Egoist* at about this time.²⁷ Like Mr. Polly, Poskett has walked out on an unsatisfactory wife; he is a dreamer with a love of words yet confined to 'a silly snippety sort o' life' and, most important of all, he is a poignantly comic mixture of courage and timidity (PB 236). Like that other early Wells character, Hoopdriver, and indeed like Wells himself, he is also a miserable physical specimen of the British urban working-class.

26 For a brief summary of this dispute, see Martin, 110–15.

27 See Jameson's Reply to Miss Pully.

Poskett's combination of courage and timidity manifests itself in a delightful mock-heroic scene in a similar vein to Mr. Polly's battle with Uncle Jim, if more pointedly political. Poskett is taken along to the *Beacon's* weekly Board Meeting by a rebellious Thurlow, fed up with attempts by the journal's wealthy female backers to interfere with his editorial policy. At the meeting, which takes place in an upper-class drawing-room, a beautifully dressed young woman puts forward a proposal to pay workers in ration tickets for drink, food, clothing and amusements, as a way of controlling the morals of the poor. Incensed at this attack on 'a plain man's freedom', Poskett finds the 'reckless courage' to face the ferociously condescending gaze of the assembled company and speak his mind. In the course of his simple but eloquent speech, however, his courage ebbs away and he sees himself suddenly as 'an ill-dressed, unheroic figure, standing like a fool in the centre of a pink wilderness – talking like a fool – babbling, stuttering' before making a desperate escape (PB 257–60).

On the level of the novel's aesthetic debate with modernism, the value of Poskett's character lies precisely in its mixed or hybrid nature, his courage and his failings being equally undeniable and of evenly balanced significance. As John Carey argues of Wells's attitude to such early characters as Kipps, Hoopdriver and Mr Polly, Jameson's attitude to Poskett combines disparagement of his very real short-comings with the conviction that his social failure has more 'warmth and life' in it than the success of her better educated, more upper-class characters (Carey 140–4). Such hybridity is an example of that 'mixed' or impure art that not only Orage and Henry James but also Denarbone's real-life progenitor, Pound, excoriated (Pound, 'Vorticism' 277). That Jameson was consciously beginning to explore the possibility of an anti-modernist aesthetic here is suggested by a caustic reference to modernism in her third novel, *The Clash*, as 'the new aesthetic morality which condemns ugliness' (139). In *The Clash*, Jameson would suggest the intolerant and exclusionary nature of this 'aesthetic morality' by comparing it, somewhat provocatively, to

‘the Victorian morality which condemns sin’ (139). She would also begin to theorise more fully a counter-balancing aesthetic of ‘the eternal Imperfect’ (193).

Jameson’s later accounts of how Poskett came into her imagination suggest a psychological source for her revolt against both Victorian and Modernist forms of purity and exclusion. According to accounts in both *Journey* and the semi-fictional *That Was Yesterday*, the figure of Poskett entered Jameson’s imagination at the moment when – like Mr. Polly before his attempted suicide – she felt at her most confined and culturally excluded.²⁸ The person she held responsible for her situation was her mother, whose Victorian morality had led her to pressurize the young Storm first into an unsuitable marriage and then into renting and furnishing a house which she herself saw as a completely unnecessary burden. Furthermore, Poskett possesses distinct similarities to Jameson’s representation of her own abject but secretly loved father in *Journey*. Like both Poskett and Polly, Captain Jameson is represented as a semi-literate, dishevelled dreamer and an imaginative liar, who loves words and who has managed to escape a disapproving and moralistic wife (in his case, by going to sea). Read in the light of this personal context, the admission by Hervey, the semi-autobiographical heroine of *That Was Yesterday*, that she ‘love[s]’ Poskett, despite the fact that he is ‘as nasty as all men and all women are’, constitutes an unconscious declaration of love on Jameson’s part for her flawed and much-reviled father and of political resistance against her mother’s moral purism, at the same time as it stakes a claim for an anti-platonic humanist aesthetic (140). Such an aesthetic consciously opposes the political implications of the variety of classicism that both Hulme and Ludovici derived from Worringer, in which abstraction is used as a method of detachment from the messiness of human existence.²⁹ It would lead, ultimately, to the *tour de force* of *A Day Off* (1933) in which Jameson’s revelation of the ‘beauty’ in an uneducated and dishonest prostitute lying snoring on a dirty sheet carries complete conviction (219).

28 See *TWY*, 32 and *JNI*, 98–9.

29 Alan Munton refers to this variety of classicism as ‘the abjection-resistance model’ (77). For a later discussion of Jameson’s literary focus on the socially abject, see Chapter 6.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown how Jameson turns her back on her own early extremism in her first novel and how she draws on her knowledge of the *New Age*, the *Egoist* and associated writers to formulate an intertextual critique of opposing 'romantic' and 'classical' extremes within early modernist thought. In the process, attention has been drawn to Jameson's new concern – following her own experience of marital abuse – regarding the psychological, and hence political, dangers inherent in the extremism of both Nietzschean philosophy and anarchism and in their influence on aesthetic practice; equally, attention has been drawn to Jameson's intellectual interest in Marsden's nominalist critique of verbal abstraction. This chapter has demonstrated how Jameson uses an economic materialist perspective to expose the arrogance and disconnection from reality of both varieties of early modernist messianism and has noted how an encounter with a more economically focused, working-class feminism is the catalyst that allows the semi-autobiographical figure of Athenais to begin to free herself from the misogyny of the *New Age*. Finally, this chapter has made the case for the intertextual presence of Wellsian Pragmatism as both a political and an aesthetic alternative to early modernist extremisms. In her next intertextual dialogue with modernism, *The Happy Highways*, Jameson returns to the question of modernist polarities and explores further several key issues. Now her work interrogates more fully the dark side of the psyche touched on in her critique of both anarchism and Nietzscheism in *The Pot Boils*; the stylistic implications of Marsden's nominalist critique of verbal abstraction; and the relevance of philosophical pragmatism in a post-war world.

Chapter 4

‘Freemen ... in a commonwealth of real things’: Looking Back on Pre-War Dreams of Anarchism in *The Happy Highways* (1920)

Introduction

Jameson wrote *The Happy Highways* between November 1917 and the winter of 1918.¹ In January 1917, the brutal reality of the Great War had broken through her domestic preoccupations when she had learnt of the death-in-action of her brother, Harold, at the pitifully young age of nineteen. In March of the same year she had herself moved a little closer to the war when Clarke got a job as an Equipment Officer and she and her small son became camp-followers, eventually ending up near an airfield in Hampshire. Not surprisingly, therefore, she wrote this second novel ‘in a different mood, not trying to be clever’ (*TWY* 274). Her purpose, this time, was not to satirise but sympathetically to ‘record, before it was too late, the colour of life before the war’ and, in particular, the ‘idealism’ of herself and her fellow London students (*TWY* 274). However, in *That Was Yesterday* Jameson adds, significantly, that in this novel she ‘still cared more for ideas than for life’ (275). The ‘ideas’ that the pre-war ‘student characters’ embody in *The Happy Highways* are the anarchistic evolutionary socialism of Edward Carpenter and Dora Marsden’s anarchistic critique of a ‘Verbal Age’, types of anarchism that Jameson had previously set against one another in her characterisation of Thurlow and Denarbon in her first novel. Despite drawing on Marsden’s modernist ideas, the *Happy Highways* students do not abandon their political idealism for Marsden’s more philosophically consistent egoism and thus they accurately reflect Jameson’s own anarcho-socialist position as a student in pre-war London.² They see themselves as ‘an intelligentsia of deeds’ in ‘an era of talk’,

1 The quotation in the above chapter title is from *HH*, 201.

2 For the fundamental difference between these two varieties of anarchism and for Jameson’s refusal to follow Marsden into pure egoism, see Chapter 1, p. 55.

dedicated to bringing about a 'new age' (*HH* 45, 240). The mediation of the students' story through the account of a war-blinded narrator, Joy Hearne, is a device that allows Jameson to investigate both the merits and the limitations of this mix of ideas, as Joy looks back at his pre-war youth with a mixture of disillusionment and nostalgia. The layers of intertextual reference within this novel thus produce a Chinese-box effect, the post-war narrator critiquing his younger self for *his* anarchist critique of pre-war culture.

The central dialogic question that the novel addresses is one that Jameson had first raised in her *Gryphon* article, 'The Unreality of Art', namely, whether Man can ever shed 'the terrified inheritance of the savage' and become peaceful and cooperative as Carpenter had argued in *The Art of Creation*, or - put another way which includes a socialist adaptation of Marsden's ideas on 'rhetorical hygiene' - whether it is possible to get away from inherited social *and* linguistic systems and create a community based on man's higher instincts (Clarke 9). Like Jameson and her fellow students in pre-war London, the students in *The Happy Highways* initially believe this to be possible.³ However, another less optimistic answer comes in the form of various bitter experiences, all of which have their origins in Jameson's own life-story. These are: the revelation of Man's primitive drives in the Great War; the solitary female student character's painful discovery of the intransigence of sexual conditioning both in herself and others; and the re-emergence into consciousness of the narrator's repressed childhood experience of human brutality. That is to say, as compared with Jameson's first novel, the materialist emphasis of *The Happy Highways* is less economic than psychological.⁴ Other new concerns in this second novel are fear of solipsism in a world where there is no longer any mystical guarantee of universal brotherhood, and the related question of how it might be possible both to retain one's individualism and to make contact with the Other. In exploring these new concerns, Jameson draws on the work of William James and, more briefly, on that of D. H. Lawrence, who would become the

3 For Jameson's changing views on this question as a student, see Chapter 2, p.70 ff.

4 For Jameson's introduction to Freudian psychology as a student, see Chapter 1, p.50.

central intertextual focus of her next two novels, *The Clash* and *The Pitiful Wife*, to be discussed in Chapter 5.

The argument of *The Happy Highways* is informed by the opposing modernist polarities of anarchism and order, romanticism and classicism, humanism and anti-humanism, that Jameson had tried to weave together into a seamless whole in *Modern Drama* and had begun to explore more critically in *The Pot Boils*. Whereas in the latter novel, the above modernist polarities had been associated with the contrasting individuals, Thurlow and Denarbon, in *The Happy Highways* they are associated with contrasting historical *zeitgeists*. Reflecting Jameson's private association of 'classical' modernism with her own northern mother's authoritarianism, a Nietzschean 'classicism' is associated not with the distant past of Ludovici and Hulme's ancient Egypt but with the more immediate past of the students' northern childhoods. Pre-war anarchism and early modernism are then seen as reactions *against* this immediate past. The contrast between these two *zeitgeists* is symbolised by the familiar modernist tropes of fluidity and barriers that recur throughout the novel. When anarchism is seen to fail as a utopian political philosophy in the face of the Great War and the primitive psychological drives that it reveals, the possibility of a return to an earlier anti-humanist order – as desired by Hulme and Ludovici – is rejected.⁵ Instead, William James's *Pragmatism* becomes the key intertext of the novel's final pages as Jameson explores in greater philosophical detail a theme first touched on in her previous novel. *The Happy Highways* ends with the narrator's Jamesian assertion of his 'will to believe' in the value of some sort of humanist ideal, an assertion that is dialogically challenged – though not invalidated – by an unattributed poem which serves as an epilogue to the novel and bears the bitterly ironic title, 'The Brotherhood of Man'. During the course of what is one of her

5 That Jameson had herself been tempted to move in the latter, right-wing direction is suggested not only by certain strands within *Modern Drama*, but also by a curious article, 'A Plea for the Arbitrary Limit', submitted to the *New Age* by Jameson shortly before her brother's death in action. In the article a nostalgia for the 'fierce individuality' of her northern childhood is associated with a plea for a Nietzschean 'strife' that would 'mak[e] sharp and distinct the edges of life', while both are opposed to an idealist internationalism (associated with the fluidity of the sea) which is seen as an impractical dream (447–8).

most aesthetically self-reflexive novels, Jameson also experiments with a wide range of literary styles – including those of Carpenter, Wyndham Lewis and D. H. Lawrence. As her students encounter other people's language use and experiment with their own, she not only finds modernist art/literature guilty of elitism and subjectivism, but also begins to explore other stylistic possibilities that lend themselves to the creation of a more socially inclusive aesthetic within the context of modernity. The 'Woman Question', on the other hand, is only a minor theme within the novel.

Beginning *in media res*, this somewhat chaotic novel can be roughly divided into four chronological stages. The first stage covers the strictly disciplined northern childhood of the narrator, Joy Hearne, and his two brothers, Mick and Oliver. The second covers the first phase of the Hearne brothers' life as students in pre-war London and forms the largest portion of the novel.⁶ During this phase, together with assorted friends they form a radical group called the Eikonoklasts, explore the metropolis for signs of a spiritual renaissance, and offer an anarcho-socialist critique of pre-war modernism, often to amusing effect. A key theme here is the difficulty and hence the elitism of much modernist art. However, with the exception of the sceptical scientist, Mick, who eventually leaves England in despair, this phase is characterised by youthful optimism and it ends with the students setting up their own workers' education scheme. The third chronological stage covers a period of disillusionment for the students during which Margaret, the only woman amongst them, gets married and divorced, Joy collapses with exhaustion, and war is declared. Finally, there is the even bleaker mid-war present from which Joy originally began to narrate his story. In this present, two of his friends – Chamberlayn and Kersent – have been killed and he himself has been blinded in the war. Having caught up with the present, the novel ends with Joy sharing with the reader his on-going struggle to work out a new philosophy for the bleaker post-war world that is coming. In the discussion of the novel

6 For the influence of Sydney and Oliver Harland on Jameson's characterisation of the Hearne brothers, see Chapter 1, p. 47, n.22.

that follows, each chronological stage is addressed in turn. The discussion of the students' disillusionment in stage three also includes a retrospective account of uncanny episodes which Joy had experienced but had ignored during the previous stage of the narrative. These uncanny episodes, it is argued, suggest that during his 'happy' idealist phase, Joy was suffering from the Freudian condition of 'blindness in seeing eyes'.⁷

A 'Classical' Northern Childhood

Set in a 'primitive' northern society, the first chronological stage of the novel evokes Nietzsche's debtor-creditor system, that is, 'the morality of custom and the social strait-jacket' whereby in primitive societies man – 'that ephemeral slave of emotion and desire' – is made 'calculable' (*Genealogy* 40, 43). A key to Jameson's intertextual reference to Nietzsche at this stage in the novel is an allusion to the 'whip' which the philosopher notoriously recommends his male readers to take with them when they go visiting a woman. In *The Happy Highways*, the patriarchal figure of Hearne uses just such a whip against his wife and three sons – Joy, Michael and Oliver – whose abuse recalls that suffered by Jameson herself at the hands of her authoritarian mother. The Nietzschean notion of an innately undisciplined Man that informs the novel's primitive northern society becomes Jameson's equivalent to the 'classical' Hulmean belief in original sin, both notions being used to justify a policy of order and control. However, the limits of patriarchal authority are suggested when, as a six-foot-tall adolescent, Joy rebels against his tyrannical father, throwing him out of the house. As the father lies dying as a consequence of alcoholism combined with this ill-treatment, he reflects that 'the strong ones [may] pay

7 Chronologically, Freud's theory of 'blindness in seeing eyes' came before his theory of the Uncanny. The earlier theory refers to a condition in which 'the "evidence" of one's senses is made to agree with the expectations of one's desires, fears or hopes' (Weber) and it is explored by Freud in his discussion of 'Miss Lucy R.', which appeared in Brill's translation of *Selected Papers on Hysteria* (1909). Freud's more complex theory of the Uncanny, on the other hand, explores the notion that the uncanny is the frightening re-emergence of 'something that was long familiar to the psyche and was estranged from it only through being repressed' (Freud, *Uncanny* 148). Although Freud's 'Das Unheimlich' (1919) was not translated into English until 1925, the uncanny moments in *The Happy Highways* suggest that Jameson may have had at least some knowledge of Freud's text by the time she wrote her novel. In combining the two theories, Jameson would appear to agree with Weber who sees them as closely related.

after all. They say – “I will make Life in my image.” And Life, maybe, slips and changes in their hands’ (*HH* 19).

Anarchistic Socialism in Pre-War London

Temporally the second chronological stage of the narrative jumps forward to the Hearne brothers’ early adult life as students at London University; culturally it skips forward *beyond* Nietzsche’s second genealogical stage to a modernity in which Christianity’s teaching of ‘a continuous sacrifice of will and personality’ is already beginning to lose its potency (*HH* 78). The following examination of this central stage of the narrative will begin by looking at the students’ political and linguistic philosophy, including scenes which provide evidence of the latter; it will then go on to explore, firstly, the students’ search for current signs of spiritual renaissance within the metropolis and, secondly, their own attempt to contribute to such a renaissance through the ‘Scheme’.

The Hearne brothers share their London flat with two other northern students, Anthony Calvert and the semi-autobiographical Margaret Douglass. Having learnt, perhaps, from their father’s dying words, the brothers approach their new cultural climate by embracing rather than attempting to control the fluidity of life. Together with Anthony and Margaret and a number of other students, they form a social-anarchist group named – like its real-life original – the ‘Eikonoklasts’. Although they have their own share of ‘peacock-arrogance’, they are less messianic than Thurlow and Denarbon in *The Pot Boils*, having a more modest sense of themselves as part of a wider historical change (*HH* 90). Their idealist views are predominantly those of the anarchistic evolutionary socialist, Edward Carpenter, as evoked, in particular, by the somewhat unusual name of the novel’s narrator, Joy. The notion of ‘joy’ encapsulates Carpenter’s faith in the innate goodness of Man. More specifically, the name alludes to the prophetic character of Democracy who is the narrator of Carpenter’s well-known long poem, *Towards Democracy*, and who equates himself with a ‘joy’ that is naturally occurring in the universe. In the opening lines of the

poem, Democracy declares 'Joy, joy arises – I arise', as he envisages the approaching Utopia in which 'men and women all over the earth shall attain ... freedom and joy (4–5).⁸

Just as Carpenter argues in another of his well-known books, *Civilisation: its Cause and its Cure*, that 'law is a strangulation' and that civilisation is 'a kind of disease' (15, 63), the students believe that theirs is a 'strangling civilisation' and that 'a mind in tune with the present order of things ... may appear healthy and ordinary, but really it's rottenly diseased' (HH 98). At the same time, with the exception of the more scientifically sceptical Mick, they also believe – like Carpenter – that they stand 'at a place in the upward path of humanity where all those forces that drive man beyond the narrow circle of his egoistic sympathies [are] bursting into conscious life' (HH 259).⁹ This process is seen in terms of Carpenter's spiritualised version of Lamarckian biology, so that manifestations of Man's 'instinct towards union with the beyond-self' are seen as natural growths – 'fumbling tendrils' or 'blind feelers' (HH 52, 92).¹⁰ As in Carpenter, the 'barriers' that threaten the development of the instinct for social union are jealousy and fear: 'The old are jealous of the young and afraid of what they'll do ... One sex is jealous of the other's power. Class is jealous and fearful of class' (HH 85 92).¹¹ Echoing the thesis of Carpenter's *The Art of Creation*, Joy – who happens to be a biology student – argues that 'we've got to choose now between our ancient instinct to sympathy and our old reasons for fear. Fear has had its biological day. It served us once, but we must escape from that prison-house' (HH 158).¹²

As for Carpenter, so for Jameson's students the 'instinct for union with the beyond-self' includes the instincts of love and sexual desire, which should be sought 'for joy ... for mere delight in and excess of life, ... for a symbol and expression of deepest soul-union'

8 See also the later poem, 'I Come Forth From the Darkness', with its refrain, 'Joy is come up' (Carpenter, *Towards* 130–6).

9 The phrase 'beyond the narrow circle' in the above quotation echoes Carpenter's notion of Man as 'enter[ing] into a wider and wider circle of life' (*Civilisation* 166). According to Delavenay, this notion was also the inspiration behind Lawrence's account of Ursula's widening consciousness in *The Rainbow* (80).

10 For Carpenter's adaptation of Lamarck, see Chapter 1, p.39, n.12 and Chapter 2, p.70.

11 Compare, for example: 'When I see ... the fear, the envy ... in which the moneyed classes live ...' (Carpenter, *Towards* 24)

12 For a summary of this thesis, see Chapter 1, pp. 45–6.

(Carpenter, *Love's* 103). Indeed the sexual attitudes of the students follow almost point by point the ideas put forward in Carpenter's widely read book, *Love's Coming of Age*.¹³ Like Carpenter in the latter text, the students believe that 'from a broad biological stand-point' love has nothing to do with social conventions and that we should try to 'get away from trousers and claw-hammer coats ... fenced-off gardens and rabbit-marriages' (*HH* 98).¹⁴ Like Carpenter, they believe that, ideally, love-making should take place 'under the burning sun', or 'under the high canopy of the stars' as does Margaret and Joy's towards the end of the novel (Carpenter, *Love's* 103). Like Carpenter, too, the students are concerned that the contemporary lack of honest sex-education causes the young to 'come a cropper through ignorance' (*HH* 84). Just as Carpenter argues that repression causes 'sex-desires' to 'assert themselves all the more in thought' (*Love's* 95), so the students are struck by the manner in which the frustrated Mrs. Mannick delights in storing up her 'harvest' of sexual scandals (*HH* 271). In contrast, Margaret sleeps with her lover, Keith Ainslie, before marriage because she believes that 'there is something indecent ... about the spectacle of two young people ... living for months or years in a kind of hot-house of exaggerated passion, until they have been solemnly legalised to take their passion to a decent marriage bed' (*HH* 37). Finally, like Carpenter, the students are opposed to a 'fierce possessive hunger' in love, or what *they* call 'family egoism' and Carpenter calls '*égoïsme à deux*' (*HH* 92, 202; Carpenter *Love's* 142). For example, they find the mutual sexual possessiveness of the artist Barlow and his wife 'positively unclean' (*HH* 95). Following Carpenter's recommendation of 'a freer, more companionable, and less pettily exclusive relationship' (*Love's* 149), Margaret 'ha[s] at least two other close friends [apart from Joy] ..., bound to her by a long and untroubled intimacy' (*HH* 202). In addition, Joy, who is in love with Margaret, practises the

13 Although *Love's Coming of Age* was first published in 1896, it was later expanded and went through numerous editions, including Methuen pocket editions in 1914 and 1915 and a new, further expanded edition in 1923. According to John Lucas, '[its] arguments continued to have potency in the years following the war' (*Radical*, 50–1).

14 Compare Carpenter's criticism of the social convention that requires a gentleman to 'put on what the Yankees call a claw-hammer coat' when he goes down to dinner (*England's* 78).

‘frank understanding and tolerance of [the beloved’s] *other* loves’ that Carpenter recommends, including of her husband, Keith (Carpenter, *Love’s* 167).

Following Marsden as well as Carpenter, and continuing the nominalist debate that Jameson had begun in *The Pot Boils*, the students regard the inherent abstraction of linguistic structures as masking both material and spiritual reality and thus facilitating the perpetuation of current power-structures. In a series of powerful episodes, they expose the screening effect of three types of (empty) intellectual concept in turn. The first of these is the liberal concept of ‘civilised values’. In the episode concerned, Jameson again attacks the conservative Wells of *The New Machiavelli* as she had in *The Pot Boils*.¹⁵ Chamberlayn, the would-be socialist son of a Duke, is said to have got his ‘bric-a-brac socialism ... out of the Wells bran-tub’ and, like Remington in Wells’s novel, he has ‘a scheme for reforming society by an alliance of Tory and Socialist’ (*HH* 54–5). Chamberlayn’s unquestioning faith in ‘civilized values’ is fiercely attacked both by Mick and by Kersent, a brilliant working-class student – and the only Marxist among them – who has struggled his way up from a London slum. Kersent points out the relative nature of Chamberlayn’s abstract moral concepts:

‘What is decency and which of us is the decent man? It has been considered decent to eat your grandmother, let alone marry her. Of course, I know you are convinced that the decencies of English family life were ordained by God on a hill in Palestine. They hang in the empyrean, like Plato’s Ideal Values...’ (*HH* 58)

More importantly, Kersent argues that such moral abstractions cause Chamberlayn to ‘deny the evidence [his] senses bring before [his] brain’ (*HH* 57), preventing him from seeing the harsh reality of life for many ordinary working-class people in England:

‘[Chamberlayn] has the *idea* of a wonderful, benevolent ruling class with the common herd clustering trustfully round ... His mind is so full of a golden haze that he just can’t see that life was never like that, nor ever will be.’ (italics added, *HH* 56)

15 Compare Marsden’s attack on Wells’s idealism in ‘Views’, 1 June 1914, 203–6.

In order to bring his nominalist point home, Kersent describes the squalid material reality of the life of one particular slum family of which he has direct experience: the father unable to keep the family on his wages as a casual labourer working night-shifts at the docks; the mother forced to lock the children out while she goes charring, which results in one of them being ‘knocked down and killed in the gutter by a dray’; the sixteen-year-old daughter working in a jam factory and forced by inadequate wages to turn to intermittent prostitution (*HH* 58). Placed within the intertextual context of the *Egoist*’s linguistic debate, Kersent’s spare account may be viewed as Jameson’s novelistic attempt to politicize the Imagist campaign to purge poetic language of abstraction by a ‘direct treatment of the thing’ (Pound, ‘Retrospect’ 59).¹⁶ Kersent’s style also recalls the linguistic strategy of the American anarchist, Morrison Swift, from whose political pamphlet, *Human Submission* (1905), William James quotes approvingly and extensively in *his* nominalist attack on the language of metaphysics in *Pragmatism* (31–3). Kadlec summarizes Swift’s strategy thus:

Swift had suggested that such ‘cloudy’ fundamentals as ‘Being’ and ‘Essence’ should be replaced by a material that was more ‘present’ and ‘actual’. And he invoked this material by quoting a series of newspaper stories about the struggles of the urban unemployed. One of Swift’s ‘First Principles’ was an out-of-work Cleveland labourer, a recent widower, who led his infant children ‘into the basement of his boarding house’ and killed them, and then ‘fired a shot at his [own] head’. (23)

Both Swift’s style and that of Kersent in *The Happy Highways* point forward to the ‘sharp, compressed, concrete style’ that Jameson would later advocate in her well-known 1930s essay on documentary fiction, ‘Documents’(15), suggesting an interesting, unexplored connection between 1930s socialist literature and pre-war linguistic debate.

The second episode illustrating the students’ anarchistic nominalism is a critique of scientific rationalism in which Mick criticises his old tutor, Sanday, although with rather more affection. Here the background ideas are more those of Carpenter than of Marsden, specifically Carpenter’s paired essays, ‘Modern Science: A Criticism’ and ‘The Science of

16 In ‘England’s Nest of Singing Birds’, Jameson singles out the Imagist poets as a possible exception to the parlous state of contemporary literature but criticises what she sees as the insensitivity of these economically secure poets to the material plight of the working classes.

the Future: A Forecast', in which he argues that the abstractions of science have become a mere 'Mumbo Jumbo' divorced from our experienced reality and that it would be more valuable for the scientists of the future to seek 'for our datum ... in the very Centre of Humanity instead of at its remotest circumference', that is, to study Man's 'I am' (*Civilisation* 125, 129).¹⁷ The episode is also informed by the widespread disillusionment with Science that was a consequence of the Great War and, yet again, H. G. Wells is an obvious intertextual target for the students' (and Jameson's) critique.

Mick's critical reflections on the science in which he himself is involved are provoked by the offer of a Research Scholarship to Cambridge University following his achievement of a First in his final examinations. In an attempt to persuade Mick to take up this scholarship, Sanday utters a eulogy which expresses complete faith in the integrity of Science. To him it is:

'a line that ... runs like a white thread through the dark ages. It shines steadily in the myriad-hued radiance of Greece. ... Where men fumble and lie to each other and themselves, science faces boldly to the truth and sets herself to *know*. Against all the ignorance and futile longings and nameless apprehensions that men have heaped up and called God, she opposes the deathless courage that will not be crushed by a fear out of the darkness or turned aside by comfortable lies.' (*HH* 104–5)

However, a comic exchange between Sanday and Mick suggests that the reality behind this ideal is rather less heroic. When Mick and Joy meet Sanday in his hermetically sealed room, the scientist goes into a long lament about the impossibility of working in the Museum Reading Room, because the human activity around him – most particularly that of 'some female ... in the next chair' – reduces him to 'feverish apprehension'. When Mick gravely suggests that he 'might have an appliance to go across [his] head and fit over both ears', Sanday takes the idea quite seriously, only to worry that he 'should still see her mouth

17 Echoes from these essays may be detected in Marsden's criticism of the Liberal Party's use of 'Mumbo-jumbo' to justify the Great War ('Views', 15 Sept. 1914, 344) and in the title of her article, 'I AM'. It is also likely that the essays are an important intertext behind the exchange between Pound and Marsden on the nature of 'the serious artist' appearing in the *New Freewoman* between 15 Oct. and 15 Nov. 1913 and that in their exchange both Pound and Marsden are implicitly arrogating to 'The Art of the Future' the function that Carpenter sets out for 'The Science of the Future', namely an understanding of man's 'I am'. For Carpenter's early influence on Marsden, see Clarke.

moving’, whereupon Mick’s lips ‘frame the word “blinkers”’ (*HH* 102–3). Mick’s humorous interjection echoes Kersent’s accusation that Chamberlain’s Liberal psychology ‘runs in blinkers’, that is, screens out reality (*HH* 56). Sanday’s narrow-minded perspective on the world and the stuffiness of his room, in which all the windows are firmly closed, recalls Carpenter’s rhetorical question:

Is it not a strange kind of science, that which wakes the mind to pursue the shadow of things, but dulls the sense of the reality of them – which causes a man to try to bottle the pure air of heaven and then to shut himself up in a gas-reeking, ill-ventilated laboratory while he analyses it? (*Civilisation* 127)

In addition, Carpenter’s argument that ‘the strength of the intellectual chain is no greater than that of the staple from which it hangs – and that is a human feeling’ is suggested in a subsequent scene in which Joy ‘thinks of Sanday and his mind turned always to some ordered and wonderful vision of a world set free by Science’ and wonders ‘what bowed, mis-shapen [psychological] creatures ran and scurried round the fringes of that disciplined march’ (Carpenter, *Civilisation* 121; *HH* 108). The implication is that Sanday’s scientific thinking may not be as detached and objective as he believes but may be skewed by ‘mis-shapen’ – because repressed – fears and desires, including those of a sexual nature. Hence Mick is forced to conclude that there is ‘no call for scientific rule’ as envisaged by Wells in *A Modern Utopia* (*HH* 113).

The third and final nominalist episode is one that draws heavily on Marsden’s attack on metaphysics in her leading article for 1 January 1915, ‘I AM’.¹⁸ In a fever-induced delirium, Joy attacks Chadding, a Professor of Philosophy, who is unconsciously helping to ‘sow the whirlwind’ of the Great War by passing on ‘the ancient lies of the social order’ (*HH* 142).¹⁹ (Later in the novel, Chadding’s social conformity will indirectly cause Kersent to die in prison for his pacifism.) The Professor’s specialism is the ‘The Abstract Truth and the

18 From a narrative perspective, this episode belongs in Stage 3, since it arises out of the students’ disintegrating situation; it is discussed here for its theme.

19 For Marsden’s exposure of how the rational language of Liberalism, with its commitment to civilised values, obscured the political realities of the Great War, see Sherry, pp. 63–4.

'Transcendental Reality' (*HH* 212), and Joy's virtuoso performance amply fulfils Marsden's prescription to 'set on the Ridiculous to dog the Sublime' ('I AM' 2). In the first part of his two-part attack, he launches into a nominalist critique of Chadding's metaphysics with arguments very similar to Marsden's critique of the philosophical use of 'the conceptual substantive' in her article ('I AM' 2). Where Marsden has philosophical terms acquiring 'a mountain of accretions', Joy has his 'poor little Chadding-ant' staggering under a Transcendental Reality 'a few times its own weight'; where Marsden describes the same terms becoming detached from their original meanings and 'float[ing] away into the wide blue Empyrean where as "Absolutes" they dwell', Joy speculates on the reality-status of a 'Truth that can arch its back in the sky and lay eggs in a professor's brain';²⁰ finally, where Marsden laments that the terms of metaphysics acquire the power of 'magicians, genii, sprites' and become 'masters of men', Joy remarks on the 'terrible power' of 'word-magic' that results in words 'mastering their men' (Marsden, 'I AM' 2; *HH* 217–8).²¹ Recalling the nominalist critique of Thurlow's Platonism in *The Pot Boils*, Chadding is hailed as 'Old servant of words' (*HH* 218).

The second part of Joy's attack is more personal and is a rhetorical attempt to discover who the 'real' Chadding is, suggesting – like Marsden in her article – that words 'have acquired the power to deflect men from their strongest desires ... their most vital instincts' so that they lose touch with 'the living "I"' ('I AM' 2). In addition, in tone and content this more cynical part of the attack recalls two episodes from Wyndham Lewis's *Tarr*, published in the *Egoist* between April 1916 and November 1917.²² The first of these is the opening episode in which Tarr encounters the Bloomsberry, Hobson, and – in 'childish sport' – proceeds to 'lay bare the secrets of his soul', and the second, is the one where Tarr reflects

20 An echo of Marsden's phrasing here can also be discerned in Kersent's comment that 'decencies of English family life ... hang in the empyrean like Plato's values' (*HH* 58).

21 For a similar attack on the metaphysicians' exploitation of the 'magic' of words, see James, *Pragmatism*, 21.

22 Later in the novel, the narrator refers to Wyndham Lewis by name as a genius-figure whose 'super-consciousness' is in touch with the *zeitgeist* (*HH* 145).

on what is beneath the outer ‘husk’ of both his own personality and that of his lover, Bertha Lunken (15, 18, 55). Echoing Tarr’s aggressive questioning of Hobson in the opening chapter of Lewis’s novel, Joy begins by rhetorically demanding of Chadding, ‘What is yourself? Is it the white podgy you under the broadcloth and the jaegar vest?’ (HH 217). He then ‘tear[s] off ... skin after skin’ of Chadding’s repressed and distorted instincts – ‘dignified jealousy, fear, self-adoration, bashful lusts’ (HH 218) – eventually reaching neither Bertha’s inner ‘astral baby’ nor Tarr’s painting-in-place-of-a-soul (Lewis, *Tarr* 55), but an empty space behind a door marked ‘Truth’ (HH 219). The episode concludes with Joy hailing Chadding as ‘Abstract Nonentity, Transcendental Husk’ (HH 219).

Before going on to examine the students’ search for positive evidence of a spiritual renaissance, it is worth pausing to consider Jameson’s brief exploration of the gender implications of Marsden’s nominalism in *The Happy Highways*. Marsden’s nominalist disapproval of women’s collective struggle for the vote is reflected in an early scene – based on Jameson’s own experience – in which Margaret gets swept up in a suffragette ‘rush’ in Hyde Park and, carried away by group-hysteria, bites a policeman. The experience marks a turning point in her view of feminism (and possibly Jameson’s own). Returning home, she is ashamed of her loss of self-possession and argues – in Marsdenian fashion – that the exercise had ‘nothing to do with ... freedom’ (HH 50). In addition, the views of Margaret and her friends reflect Marsden’s move away from the early counter-types of the ‘freewoman’ and Carpenter’s ‘intermediate type’ and towards a concern to ‘break down the conception of [all] types into individuals’ (Marsden, ‘Views’, 15 Oct. 1913, 166). Thus, for example, in their encounter with a female ILP journalist called Tommy, the students understand that the journalist is somewhat pathetically trapped in her own version of the sexual counter-type, desperate to be ‘credited with a masculine outlook’ and to be

considered ‘a sport and a good fellow’ (*HH* 164).²³ Jameson goes on to expose the practical flaws in Marsden’s gender-blindness in the third stage of the novel.

In their enthusiastic search for signs of a spiritual Renaissance, the *Happy Highways* students plunge into the cultural ‘vortex’ of pre-war London (*HH* 178). Exploring the city, they come across a number of signs of change, including a T.P.’s Circle; the bohemian Chelsea arts set, in which women wear dresses created according to ‘Bakst-like designs’ and attend lectures on ‘scenic art’; and an Ethical Church (*HH* 93–4).²⁴ Despite their willingness to give these groups the benefit of the doubt, the students sadly conclude that – unlike the ‘intertwining, many-coloured streams’ that Carpenter imagines will join together to create an anarcho-socialist Utopia – these various contemporary movements are only inconsequential trickles:

Suppose there were tiny holes in the barriers that hold these [social instincts] in check, would not the waters trickle out into just such little pools of T.P.’s Circles, and Societies to Enforce Peace, and art and poetry circles, and all the rest of the futile ways through which men try to express their sub-conscious longing for social unity founded on brotherly respect and understanding. (*HH* 93)

The students become a little more hopeful when they come across Stavrillov, a Kandinsky-like character who paints abstract compositions which express ‘not men or things, but states of mind’ (*HH* 93). However, it is only when they visit the Second Post-Impressionist Exhibition at the Grafton Galleries and see a wide range of art making a radical break from existing conventions that they become excited by the possibility that they have discovered ‘the tempestuous morning energy of a new art’, ‘the forerunner of some youthful renascence’ (*HH* 139, 142).²⁵ They come away ‘in a state of incredible

23 Jameson includes a small intertextual joke at Marsden’s expense here by bestowing her first name, Dora, on Tommy’s male partner.

24 T.P.’s Circles were an off-shoot of the middle-brow journal, *T. P.’s Weekly*, in which readers met to discuss Literature; the bohemian Chelsea set included figures like Augustus John, Boris Anrep and Lytton Strachey; the Ethical Church was a non-religious, humanist church set up by Bernard Bosanquet, William Wallace and others and attended by Gilbert Murray and Ramsay Macdonald amongst others.

25 Jameson was presumably referring to the Second Post-Impressionist Exhibition (which took place in the autumn of 1912) when she recalled seeing ‘the first Cézannes in London’ as an M.A. student before the war, although some Cézannes *were* included in the first exhibition in 1910 (*JNI* 64).

exultation', but their perspective on the new art almost immediately becomes problematised when the dissident Oliver asks a policeman at the entrance to the exhibition what *he* thinks of the paintings and the policeman replies that he can see 'neither art nor beauty in them' (*HH* 139).

The problem of adapting modernist art to the needs of ordinary working-class people is further explored in a comic scene in which the students attend a planning meeting for a (fictional) new futurist/vorticist journal entitled *The Machine*. The project is the brain-child of an English artist and an American poet, suggesting an allusion to Wyndham Lewis and Ezra Pound and their vorticist journal, *Blast*, but unlike *Blast*, *The Machine* is dedicated to 'the soul of the worker' (*HH* 155). The intellectual superiority of many contemporary modernists is sent up mercilessly as the artist – sounding more like Pound than Lewis – declares:

'I have been ... in tramcars, and looking at the tired faces and worn, stained hands, wondered what dreams and ambitions strained behind those stolid masks. I have thought that we who know so much, we tolerant, audacious ones, might go – reverently – "lights in hands ..." – and open the world for those anxious eyes.' (*HH* 155)

The inadequacy of modernist art to represent the life of the working-classes is suggested both by a poem read out by the American and by a drawing shown by the artist. Recalling some of the wonderful parodies of modernist literature in the *New Age*, the poem sends up the hubris and machismo of both futurist and vorticist movements:²⁶

If you were a girder you would feel that which I do –
The iron throbbing of a new heart:
The heart of the new world
The world that we have made.
It throbs as the Nasmyth hammer throbs,
In steel and granite it is forging a fresh creation.
God was an amateur: even his rocks are our playthings.
In our naked impulse we challenge malignant Nature. (*HH* 156)

The artist's (large) drawing 'of a naked and horribly bulbous female', on the other hand, is a satirical tilt at Cubism (*HH* 158). At the meeting is Donal, a token real worker who fulfils a

26 See Ardis for examples and discussions of such parodies (*Modernism* 143, 148; 'Dialogics' 420–1).

similar satirical function to Poskett at the *Beacon* meeting in *The Pot Boils*. When Donal sees the drawing, his patience finally cracks and he walks out, cursing, ‘Hell to your imaginings ...! Art ...!’ (HH 158).²⁷

Discovering that Donal is an autodidact who had attended the meeting in the hope of gaining some support for his studies, the students are finally galvanized into making their own contribution to the achievement of a spiritual renaissance in a ‘Scheme’ which with true nominalist fervour they ‘shr[i]nk from defining’ (HH 159). Before discussing this next move, however, it is worth pausing to consider Jameson’s experiment with one more literary style – along with documentary fiction (Kersent’s account of a slum), Lewisian satire (the ‘exfoliation’ of Chadding) and vorticist/futurist poetry – within the narrative that covers this second chronological stage of *The Happy Highways*. This is ‘a kind of song to love’ in poetic prose, which is delivered by the aspiring poet, Oliver, and is a pastiche of Carpenter’s mystical-erotic style in parts of his long Whitmanesque poem, *Towards Democracy*, though it is less powerfully sexual (HH 150–1). It is particularly reminiscent of the poem ‘By the Shore’ in *Towards Democracy* in which the speaker and the sea become one (192–5). Just as in Carpenter’s poem the speaker listens to the hypnotic sound of the waves at night until he is suddenly ‘the great living Ocean itself’, so Oliver becomes the sea after listening to it calling up the valley to him. Just as the speaker in Carpenter’s poem ‘detached ... from the shore/ ... becomes free’ and ‘float[s] out and mingle[s] with the rest’, so Oliver becomes ‘diffuse’, ‘float[s] on the cold green waves’ and is ‘in all things’. Where in ‘By the Shore’ the speaker’s hair ‘floats leagues behind me’, Oliver’s hair ‘brushe[s] ... the stately galleons of the sky’. Where in ‘By the Shore’ the speaker hears the ‘gurgling laughter’ of the waves, Oliver – *as* the sea – runs ‘with white foam of laughter along the untouched sand’. Just as Oliver’s is a ‘song of love’, so the speaker of Carpenter’s poem ‘pours [his] soul out ... in love’. Just as Oliver sees himself as a Christ-like healing figure who banishes

27 Donal’s parting words may be an allusion to the famous dictum of anarchist and Leeds Arts Club member, Eric Gill: ‘To Hell with Culture’ (Klaus and Knight 9).

‘all the sorrows of the world’, the speaker of Carpenter’s poem ‘takes the thread from the fingers that are weary’. Finally, the notion of ‘ecstasy’ – associated with images of ‘throbbing’, ‘pressing’, ‘thrusting’ and ‘bursting’ – in Oliver’s song is a less extreme version of the *jouissance* that periodically erupts within Carpenter’s verse in *Towards Democracy*.

In his article ‘Writing the Body: Edward Carpenter, George Gissing and Late-Nineteenth-Century Realism’, Scott McCracken observes how ‘the universal subjectivity of *Towards Democracy*’, through which Carpenter invites the reader ‘to engage in the breaking down of determinist structures’, ‘threatens to dominate the celebrated pluralism’ of the poem. McCracken terms this process ‘domination by inclusion’, as opposed to the ‘domination by exclusion and definition’ which occurs through the ‘subject-object distinction’ maintained in the realist novel (184, 186). McCracken also observes how the utopian subjectivity of *Towards Democracy* exists in ‘one timeless space’ which cuts the poem off from political dialogue with ‘other’ times and spaces (188).

Jameson’s intertextual critique of Carpenter’s style in the above episode from *The Happy Highways* suggests similar concerns which are expressed obliquely through the dramatic context in which Oliver’s ‘song’ is delivered. Oliver addresses it to Margaret in an attempt to woo her and concludes with a coercive appeal for her love: ‘I tried to find again that joy. But I could not. Not until now have I understood what held me back ... I might have all the world else, but not you. If you deny me, how can I ever be free again? You cannot deny me’ (HH 151). There is also a sense of subtly coercive pressure and ‘domination by inclusion’ in the ‘odd emphasis’ of Oliver’s manner of delivery that mesmerizes not only Margaret but also Joy, who is a witness to the scene, until – like the ideal reader in Carpenter’s poem – they stand with the speaker ‘in a place held above time and the world’ (HH 151). Consolidating the episode’s paradoxical suggestion of domination-through-lyricism is a comparison of Oliver to a Viking (invader?). The fear of solipsism that lies behind this drive to dominate ‘by inclusion’ is suggested by Jameson’s description of Oliver’s reaction to Margaret’s refusal of him. This description alludes to an

important passage towards the end of Carpenter's essay, 'Civilisation: Its Cause and Cure', in which Carpenter explains that his mystical evolutionary socialism is a cure for the cosmic isolation of the individual ego, which he describes as 'the gulf which lies below seemingly ready to swallow [man] up' (*Civilisation* 72). Similarly, Oliver stares at Margaret 'as a man might stare over the edge of a dizzy gulf', suggesting that his love for her is, likewise, an attempt to cure his own existential angst (*HH* 151). The motif of the separating gulf, signifying fear of solipsism, is one that recurs later in the novel.

To return to the students' 'Scheme', this is a workers' education initiative that is an intuitive, voluntarist response to the plight of Donal and other eager working-class autodidacts.²⁸ Giving a socialist turn to Marsden's nominalism, the students see Donal and his fellow workmen (though not, at this stage, women) as ideally suited to the task of creating a spiritual renaissance: the world is 'crying out for a new mind to understand it, a new heart to fashion it' and – with 'no academic shackles to burst' – 'the intellect of the working class' has the necessary 'vigour and freshness' to 'make it new' (*HH* 177–8). Although this approach may have something in common with the modernist tendency to idealise a less highly articulate working-class as primitive non-verbal Other, the practical details of the 'Scheme' are more grounded in every day reality. Indeed, in approach it belongs to a rare type of working-class education that Rowland Kenney in his series of articles for the *New Age*, 'Education for the Workers', terms 'revolutionary', that is to say, one that creates the conditions in which the working-class could produce its own revisionary body of knowledge without 'patronage of any kind' (Kenney 652–3).²⁹ The students very soon abandon their initial temptation to preach evolutionary socialism to the men in a manner reminiscent of the messianic students of *The Pot Boils*. Instead, they live up to their own anarchistic theories by becoming 'a kind of bureau', writing text-books that

28 The novel's title is, appropriately, an allusion to the WEA's journal, the *Highway*, and is also perhaps a private tribute to the hard work of Jameson's tutors for the WEA at Leeds.

29 For a discussion of Kenney's articles as symptomatic of the egalitarian approach of *New Age* Guild Socialists to the question of 'working-class educationalism', see Ardis, *Modernism*, 164–6. However, Orage's own style, like that of Pound, is considerably more patronising.

the men can use by themselves and responding to the needs of students individually (*HH* 176).³⁰ In addition, the men themselves take it in turn to give their own lectures ‘about the things they knew best, their work, their life, their views on education and politics’ so that the students running ‘the scheme’ ‘learned a good deal more than [they] taught’ (*HH* 169, 177). Although the men’s voices are not themselves heard within the text of *The Happy Highways*, which focuses on the students’ story, the notion of multiple, historically placed subjectivities implied by the ‘Scheme’ may be seen to anticipate the ‘heteroglossic narrative’ of Jameson’s later *Mirror in Darkness* trilogy and *Mass Observation*, both of the 1930s (Briganti, ‘Thou’ 67).

Ideological Disillusionment and Freud’s ‘Blindness in Seeing Eyes’

In the third chronological stage of the novel, the students’ linguistic and political theories begin to collapse into ‘Chaos’ – the title of the novel’s third and final Book – as they discover that it is not so easy to sweep away hampering conventions and liberate the supposedly benign instincts that lie beneath; fear and jealousy have emphatically *not* ‘had their biological day’. The students’ anarchistic sexual theories are the first to unravel, exposing flaws not only in Carpenter’s evolutionary optimism but also in Marsden’s gender-blind nominalism. Difficulties arise in relation to Margaret’s position as the only female student within the group. According to the students’ Carpenterian theories, it should have been possible for them to manage their sexual and emotional relationships in an open and sensitive manner. However, as a result of Mick Hearne’s early teachings on the subject of free love, by the time (the semi-autobiographical) Margaret arrives in London, she has already become more emotionally entangled than she wishes with Keith Ainslie, (a semi-fictional version of Jameson’s first husband, Charles Clarke), whom she met as an undergraduate student at a northern university. Keith is a weaker character than

30 Jameson’s ideas may have developed out of her own experience of the ‘preposterous and foredoomed scheme’ of the Working Women’s College at Earl’s Court, in which she was involved during her M.A. year. This ‘scheme’ ‘pick[ed] young women out of mills and factories’ and gave them ‘two or three months’ education’ rather as one might administer a tonic (*JNI* 67).

either Margaret or her London friends, but having slept with him in her first youth Margaret finds herself tied to him by feelings of loyalty and pity which result in the couple becoming engaged. When she subsequently develops a more powerful emotional and sexual bond with Joy, to her surprise Margaret finds it impossible to practise free love. She thus discovers the limits of her own – and Marsden’s – nominalist anarchism: ‘It is not, after all, so easy to slough off the puritan reverence for words that can make our bowels turn to water at the mere flourish of phrases about chastity and licence’ (*HH* 202). This anarchism has not taken into account the power of the irrational and the strength of Margaret’s northern conditioning or what Althusser would later term ideological interpellation.

Joy and Margaret also discover the limitations of Carpenter’s ‘soul-union’ when they steal a week’s holiday together in a small northern seaside village before Margaret’s impending marriage. This episode alludes to D. H. Lawrence’s second novel, *The Trespasser* (1912), in which the unhappily married Siegmund steals a week with his lover, Helena, on the Isle of Wight, with tragic consequences. The title of Lawrence’s novel evokes the concept of ‘trespassing’ on the psychological space of the Other, a concept which can be seen as intrinsic to Lawrence’s own critical revisioning of Carpenter’s sexual idealism.³¹ This concept is explored in particular in Chapter 7 of Lawrence’s novel, in which Siegmund and Helena are caught on ‘a ledge or platform’ at the base of a cliff with the tide coming in (83). In this chapter, the dreamy idealist, Helena, cannot initially face the brute life-force of the elements and leaves Siegmund to commune with them alone, the moment of ‘soul-union’ coming later when she does finally lose her fear and is ‘moulded to [Siegmund] in pure passion’ (84). Not long afterwards, however, the differences between the pair begin to re-emerge and each in turn feels the need to reassert his or her Self.

In the equivalent episode from *The Happy Highways*, Joy and Margaret find themselves in an almost identical situation, namely, cut off on a platform of rock at the base of a cliff

31 For Carpenter’s influence on Lawrence’s literary career as a whole, see Delavenay.

with the tide coming in. In this episode, the ‘pagan’ Margaret first recalls the manner in which she grew out of an adolescent idealism very much in the vein of Lawrence heroines like Helena, and then happily abandons herself to ‘the universal madness’ of the elements, uniting with Joy – in the prescribed Carpenterian manner – ‘in an exultant ecstasy’ (*HH* 38, 189). Soon afterwards, however, just as in Lawrence, the differences between the pair begin to re-surface, with Joy beginning to feel a very Lawrentian ‘apathy and ... resentment’ at Margaret’s invasion of his Self (*HH* 189). Just as in Lawrence, although spiritual/sexual union may provide a momentary door to the Unknown, it is not a final solution, for the Self must ultimately go on alone. Thus, Joy discovers that ‘every self should have its virgin fortress ... There must be barriers’ (*HH* 190).³²

In the final stage of the unravelling of the students’ anarchistic sexual theories, Margaret attempts to maintain her relationships with her (male) anarcho-socialist friends and continue her work for the ‘Scheme’ once she has married Keith and gone to live in suburbia. She has failed, however, to reckon with the conventional uxoriousness of Keith from whose training ‘few of the sanctified decencies had been omitted’ (*HH* 200). Keith’s possessiveness is exacerbated by Oliver’s jealous disapproval of Margaret’s new husband and a debacle ensues. (Joy follows events from his sickbed, having collapsed from the strain of running the ‘Scheme’ at the same time as working on his own studies.) The climax occurs when, tortured by jealousy and mistrust, Keith publicly accuses Margaret of having an affair with Oliver and sets in train their divorce. The episode suggests the degree to which Marsden’s high-minded attitude to the ‘abstractions’ of gender difference underestimates the psychological damage that can be inflicted by society’s sexual double-standard. Exposed to public shame in the divorce courts, ‘the lifting vitality’ disappears ‘from [Margaret’s] voice and her pose’ and ‘in her raw misery she ask[s] nothing but to be left behind her defences until she [has] made herself a new shell to cover the shrinking

32 Compare Jameson’s early concern regarding symbolist drama’s ‘impertinent invasion of [the spectator’s] personality’, discussed in Ch. 2.

spirit' – an image that ironically reverses Carpenter's optimistic notion of spiritual exfoliation (*HH* 222, 237).

The limits of human brotherhood also become evident when war is declared and, reeling with shock, Joy realises that – despite his theoretical nominalism – his anarchistic evolutionary socialism has all the time been infused with its own neo-platonic naivety:

Kings, generals, ambassadors, all the pageantry of sovereigns, what were they but a masque playing itself out before a curtain, while behind them on the real stage the real play was preparing, the play of humanity moving to the republic of the world? (*HH* 241).³³

Now, in place of this evolutionary socialist fantasy, the 'gulf' of solipsism that Carpenter had sought to escape in 'Civilisation: Its Cause and Cure' 'open[s] in front of Joy (*HH* 248). In addition, much to the surprise of both Joy and Mick, they find themselves desiring to defend their country despite their nominalist understanding that 'there are no races or nations: there are only men and other men' (*HH* 254).³⁴

Joy's new recognition of the 'gulf' between man and man and of the self-deception involved in his previous dream of universal brotherhood is confirmed in the fourth and final chronological stage of the novel when, having been blinded in combat, he reflects:

When I could see men, my eyes deceived me that I touched them and had intercourse with them. Now that the tricky glass is broken, I understand that it was shadows I called and shadows answered me. (*HH* 287)

In this passage Jameson's highly allusive use of the trope of blindness is not only a rather bitter inversion of the famous passage on Love in St. Paul's 'Letter to the Corinthians', I:13, it also alludes simultaneously to a poem in Carpenter's *Towards Democracy* entitled 'The Voice of One Blind' and to Freud's theory of 'blindness in seeing eyes', setting up a dialogue between the latter texts.³⁵ In 'The Voice of One Blind', Carpenter's blind man discovers that it was when he could see that he was most morally blind; his physical

33 The Platonic image of the curtain or veil is one used frequently in Carpenter's *Towards Democracy*. See, for example, 'A Military Band'.

34 For a similar view of the concept of 'race', see Marsden, 'Views', 15 July 1913, 24.

35 Jameson's use of Freud's theory is further discussed in Chapter 6 in relation to her novel, *Three Kingdoms*.

blindness, on the other hand, puts him in touch with an intuitive realm he had previously ignored and he understands for the first time the nature of human sympathy.

Alone? Ah no! who shall describe the *joy* that has come upon me?
The blow that should have crushed me broke my chains,
And I, that was the prisoner, am free ...
The touches and the hands, the voices and the sweet caresses;
How they come nearer, now!
I go no more to seek, I stay at home, and let them come to me. (*Towards* 327–8)

Against the optimistic account of ‘blindness in seeing eyes’ being followed by sight in blind eyes in Carpenter’s poem, Jameson sets a bleaker Freudian version. Like Carpenter’s speaker, Joy discovers that he can see more clearly now that he is physically blind, but instead of gaining faith in human brotherhood, he loses it, coming to a more realistic view of Man as ‘a prisoner behind [the] bars’ of his own solipsism (*HH* 286).

The notion that Joy has hitherto been psychologically blind is confirmed by uncanny moments in his pre-war narrative which form a pattern for the reader in retrospect, so that it becomes clear that as a student – perhaps like Jameson herself – he was repressing the lesson that his childhood experience of abuse had taught him, namely that, as Freud believed, ‘behind the veneer of civilisation there remains ... a buried mass of crude primitive tendencies, always struggling for expression’ (Jones 123). Joy’s harsh childhood experiences marked him and his brothers to such an extent that, having narrated them, he asks (not once but three times): ‘With these memories in our hearts, how should we be aught but *different* and harder?’ (italics added, *HH* 19). Yet on arriving in London and converting to evolutionary socialism, he finds it convenient to ignore these memories which so blatantly conflict with his new religion. His repressed infantile fear subsequently erupts into his consciousness in experiences of the uncanny at moments when he is in a vulnerable or abnormal state – alone and undistracted, in the dark, in a fever, in a dream or reverie. The first indication that all is not well is provoked by Mick who, having returned home to Yorkshire in a state of indecision as to what to do with his life, asks his brother: ‘How can I know my own mind? What is in my mind?’ (*HH* 107). This disturbing question

evokes in Joy a vivid and uncanny image from their northern childhood of ‘a particularly grotesque’ idiot who ‘shambled through the village on hands and feet’ (*HH* 107). Believed to have been struck ‘dumb and blasted’ by the horrors he had seen on a short cut through the churchyard one midnight, the idiot was an animistic reminder to the young Hearne brothers of the terrible consequences of breaking a taboo. Yet, sitting outside a concert hall at night and feeling at odds with both the harmonies coming from within and the sounds of nature without, the student Joy decides to break the northern taboo against introspection and address his brother’s question (*HH* 107).³⁶ His answer begins with a simple sketch of modern theories of the unconscious:

Psychologists and philosophers have likened the mind to a stream. On the surface lie the conscious thoughts and desires, and far below run the hidden currents of impulse and feelings that rarely emerge into the light of day. (*HH* 108)

Joy goes on to reach a conclusion that makes even Freud seem optimistic. Far from being ‘confined to the lowest dungeon’ of the unconscious and ‘emerg[ing] only at catastrophic moments’, Man’s savagery is habitual and all too plain to see, ‘taking tea upstairs, or officiating at High Mass’ (*HH* 108).

A second uncanny moment – involving an animistic fire – occurs after Mick has left England (*HH* 124–8). As the remainder of the students prepare to launch the ‘Scheme’, they ‘bl[o]w [them]selves into a great bladder of enthusiasm and mount[] on it with perilous buoyancy’. An unnamed dissatisfaction that has its origins in repressed childhood experience rises to the surface of Joy’s psyche, however, when he has a rare moment alone in the flat. Short of kindling, he throws on the fire a ‘great bunch of heather’ which he and his brothers have brought from home to remind themselves of their status as ‘haughty exiles’ in London. As if in revenge at this act of treachery, the fire appears to come alive. The burning heather produces a ‘pungent, acrid smell’ which transports Joy ‘in the blink of

36 The first, northern stage of the narrative also gives an account of the Hearne brothers’ primitive belief in vengeful animistic beings when they were children. Both this and their beliefs regarding the disabled village idiot are consistent with Freud’s argument that the uncanny leads us back to ‘the animistic phase in the development of primitive peoples’ (*Uncanny* 147).

an eyelid' to the farm kitchen of his childhood, where a 'phantom' peat fire burns, 'murmuring' of the moors whose spirit it contains. As if compelled, Joy 'impulsively' flings the socialist pamphlet he has been reading into the flames which 'hiss[] and mock[]' and – by a curious trick of time – '[t]he ashes sw[EEP] up the stone chimney and the moor wind bl[o]w[s] them down the road the Romans made.' The repressed knowledge that erupts from Joy's subconscious in this animistic moment is of the power of the instinct for possession, for – like his fellow dales folk – he himself has felt 'the painful tug of old instinctive hatreds' sprung from the struggle against the 'harshness and the cruel strength of the upland dales'. The primitive emotions of Joy's Yorkshire farmers pose a threat to his anarcho-socialist utopianism, for 'to the tide that sweeps out from the towns and cities they will oppose the wall of their blind hatred of alien things'.

Ignoring this second moment of insight, Joy continues his work for the 'Scheme' surrounded by the grotesque uncanniness of 'ordinary' daily life under modern capitalism: 'Vast stone buildings braving the stars, and at the foot of the steps a huddled woman, spoiled, broken and utterly undone' (*HH* 181).³⁷ It is only in retrospect that Joy recognises in his obsessive work at this time an attempt to escape an uncanny fear of being buried alive – 'I worked like a man imprisoned in a fallen tunnel, delving frenziedly at the earth' (*HH* 211).³⁸ As his hysteria mounts, the young Joy's health breaks down and, in a state of delirium, he attempts to find emotional relief by verbally undressing the hapless Professor Chadding. Looking back and 'seeing in blind eyes', however, Joy-as-narrator wonders whether the professor was in fact his uncanny double, reflecting the vacuity of his own idealist position and even, possibly, of meaning itself (*HH* 219).³⁹

37 This image suggests Vidler's Marxist uncanny of 'homelessness generated ... by the unequal distribution of wealth' (qtd. in Royle 6).

38 For 'the uncanny idea of being buried alive', see Freud, *Uncanny*, 150.

39 In Freud's theory, the double embodies 'all the [ejected] possibilities ... to which our imagination still clings' (*Uncanny* 142).

The Mid-War Present and William James's Pragmatism

Towards the end of the novel, with the wisdom of experience, Joy concludes that it is impossible to get completely beyond the barriers of language and inherited social mores, for 'there will always be prejudice' (*HH* 285). He then contemplates the possibility of a return to the prejudices of his northern elders, prejudices of which the reader has been kept in mind by various irascible letters and spiteful prohibitions emanating from the students' parents during the course of the novel: 'Suppose restraint – prejudice – were necessary to the *hardening* and *sharpening* of youth?' (italics added, *HH* 285). However, Joy rejects this Hulmean option, turning instead to a compromise position: 'If a man could destroy within himself the bitterness of prejudice ... To train oneself to understand and to respond would be to rob prejudice of its sting' (*HH* 285). This position recalls that of William James in his essay, 'The Will to Believe', where he argues that whilst being aware that 'we are all ... absolutists by instinct', we should treat this fact 'as a weakness' and attempt to 'free ourselves, if we can' by continuously 'experiencing and thinking over our experience' (*Will* 14).

In addition to such self-awareness, having rejected both the traditional morality of his childhood and the naïve idealism of his student years, Joy must find a new theory of truth and a new method for negotiating the ethical choices of a pluralist post-war world. Reflecting on this problem, he arrives at an approach very similar to that of James's pragmatist philosophy. Brief allusions to this philosophy have already been made during the course of Joy's narrative; now they come firmly to the fore. Earlier in the narrative, shadows on the Thames at night symbolically enact James's 'conjunctive' and 'disjunctive' relations as they 'mak[e] patterns and break[] them' (*Pragmatism* 53; *HH* 59). In addition, both Oliver and Margaret echo James's account of meaning as in-the-making, built out of the flux by an unending process in which theories are continuously tested against experience and modified accordingly. Thus Margaret, argues that 'truth [i]s but a fragment

of a vision ... that might be a falsehood tomorrow'; while Oliver accuses Futurism of failing to test its theories against experience, 'build[ing] itself out over the air, held to the earth by [a] tenuous thread' (*HH* 245, 262). And – to give a couple of final examples – in a discussion of what makes people lose their youthful idealism and desire for social service in later life, Joy echoes two concepts from the final chapters of James's *Pragmatism*. Firstly, there is the notion that there *are* real losers in life and that such losers may put less courageous individuals off working for 'the ideal as an ultimate, not as an origin' (*Pragmatism* 114). Where James quotes a Greek epigram in which a shipwrecked sailor offers us a posthumous reminder that other sailors *have* 'weathered the gale', Joy argues that many are put off fighting for an ideal by 'the blind, fearful pressure of the innumerable dead who struggled and failed before us' (*Pragmatism* 114; *HH* 71). Secondly, and relatedly, where James argues that a 'radical pragmatist' must be a risk taker because reality 'is still pursuing its adventures', Joy argues that often 'we would rather be left in the filth we are used to than adventure on an untried road' (*Pragmatism* 99; *HH* 72).

At the end of the novel, having lost his evolutionary socialist faith, Joy must decide whether he is 'justified' in believing in anything anymore. In approaching this question, he considers the alternatives of two friends killed in the war, Chamberlayn and Kersent, both of whom have fulfilled one of James's key criteria for being considered 'a genuine pragmatist', namely, they were willing not only to 'act' but to act by 'pay[ing] with [their] own person ... for the realisation of the ideals which [they] frame[d]' (*Pragmatism* 115). Serving as a contrast to both these men is the Christian pacifist, Mannick, whom Joy excoriates because he 'stood aside not only from the slaughter but from the suffering,' 'placidly' withdrawing 'from the agony of this injustice of war' (*HH* 272–3). Kersent's case, however, does not fulfil a second of James's key criteria for being termed a genuine pragmatist, namely that of 'plasticity' (*Pragmatism* 93).⁴⁰ In intertextual contrast to James's

40 Compare James's argument that it is 'the great assumption of the intellectualists ... that truth means essentially an inert static relation' (*Pragmatism* 77).

adventurous ship-wrecked sailor, he ‘placed [him]self and [his] faith on an unshakable rock, above all winds that blow’ (HH 246). He did so by choosing to believe in the absolute ‘sanctity of life’, ‘as if life were somehow static, a changeless attribute to be predicted of all animate things’ (HH 278). Chamberlayn, on the other hand, may be considered a genuine pragmatist because he fought for ‘the second best, undeterred by its imperfections’, that is to say, he fought for ‘the English ideal of governance lest a worse be put in its place’ not for ‘the slums with their starved and verminous children’ or the ‘millions of his fellows on the edge of scrambling respectability, cowed and coarsened by the insecurity that dogs them from birth to death’ (HH 277, 281).

Seeking for a belief to live by, as both Chamberlayn and Kersent sought for a belief to die by, Joy adopts the pragmatic approach to truth as something that ‘happens to an idea. It ... is made true by events’ (James *Pragmatism* 77–8). Thus, for example, he reflects that, having become blind, he ‘ha[s] proved to [his] own satisfaction that the soul dwells not in the eyes’ (HH 258). Similarly, by their deaths he supposes that Kersent and Chamberlayn have been able to test the hypothesis of eternal life. Thus he remarks of Kersent: ‘[He] has been able to make the final test. Who shall say what he has proved or discovered?’, while of Chamberlayn he demands, ‘Have you no warning for me, old ghost?’ (HH 258, 277). As in James’s pragmatist philosophy, Joy sees belief as ‘justified’ by events, although by his death Kersent appears to have ‘taken alike his justification and his future’ with him and Joy imagines him mocking him with the words, ‘I remain unjustified, and ye also’ (HH 279).⁴¹

In the final pages of the novel, as Joy struggles to know what to think and indeed what to write, despair and hope follow one another, like the earlier shadows on the Thames, ‘making patterns and breaking them’. In a moment of despair, blind and alone, he reflects, ‘What does it matter to me now? I shall not live to see which fought best for the World-State of their fumbling imaginations ... What does it matter to me? My faith, how lonely I am’ (HH 281). Soon afterwards, however, Margaret joins him and commits herself to him

41 For James’s notion of ‘justification’ by events, see *Pragmatism*, 80.

– having been held up only by the death of an uncle – and there follows a Carpenteresque love scene in the outdoors. This experience seems to offer evidence of a mystical communion informing all Creation. Again, a little later, Joy has an uncanny visitation in a dream, not from the ghost of Chamberlayn, as he had requested, but from that of Kersent. The dead Kersent laughs at his own previous ideal of ‘brotherly love’, and to Joy’s question as to the nature of men he replies (alluding to the scientific theory of heat-death) that they are ‘A dawn-brood of birds who are dead i’ the sun’ (*HH* 286).⁴² It is following Kersent’s ghostly visitation that Joy comes to realise his previous psychological blindness. He struggles to retain at least a belief in the possibility of human relationship – ‘Once on a storm-threshed rock, and once in a forest, surely my spirit had leaped to touch another’ – but ‘a terrible gulf open[s] in front of [him]’ (*HH* 287).

The novel concludes with Joy embarking on a pragmatic path midway between the extremes of the ghostly Kersent’s pessimistic scientific materialism and the evolutionary-socialist idealism of his own student days; between the notions of a Darwinian world destined to end in heat-death and of a world of brotherly love headed ineluctably towards Utopia. In a version of James’s argument that ‘there are moments of discouragement in us all, when ... we want a universe where we can just give up, fall on our father’s neck’, Joy at first cries out for Margaret in despair and buries his head in her breast for comfort (*Pragmatism* 112–3). However, unlike his brother Oliver (and Carpenter), he does not wish to merge his identity with another in order to cure his own existential angst. Therefore, accusing himself with the words, ‘[Am] I a sick man or a child to be running for comfort?’ (*HH* 287), he refuses to join the ranks of James’s ‘sick-minded’ (*Pragmatism* 113). Instead he demonstrates a Jamesian ‘will to believe’, reaffirming the humanistic value of life even without the guarantee of Eternity: ‘Life is a good horse to ride, and death a good ostler, whosoever may keep the Inn’ (*HH* 287). In so doing, he re-embarks on life not as an idealistic fantasy or ‘happy highway’, but as ‘a real adventure, with real danger’, yet one in

42 For Carpenter’s philosophy as a response to the fear of ‘heat-death’, see Clarke, 37.

which ‘we may yet win through’ (*Pragmatism* 112). This new, pragmatic road is a ‘dappled’ one that ‘runs behind and before’, its risks symbolised by ‘the wind tear[ing] apart the crying trees’ (*HH* 287). As mentioned earlier, it is dialogically challenged by the bitterly ironic poem, ‘The Brotherhood of Man’, with which the novel ends, yet the reader is left to suppose that Joy will, nonetheless, carry on with the project that has brought him back to the north, that is, to persuade its hill-farmers of the benefits of socialism.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown how, in *The Happy Highways*, Jameson continues the intertextual critique of her own student radicalism which she had begun in *The Pot Boils*; how modernist polarities are written into the very structure of her second novel; and how, this time, her critical focus is primarily on the ‘romantic’ pole of early modernism, in particular on the anarchistic belief in the possibility of escape from inherited social and linguistic structures to purer forms of communication and social experience that lie beyond. Through its analysis of the manner in which Jameson uses Freud’s theories of ‘blindness in seeing eyes’ and the uncanny almost as a form of semi-autobiographical self-diagnosis, this chapter has suggested the bitterness of Jameson’s mid-war disillusionment with her early romantic modernism in a novel that is effectively a final farewell to her pre-war self. On the other hand, analysis of her varied experiments with language in *The Happy Highways* has also indicated both the thoughtfulness of Jameson’s response to the representational challenge that modernism posed and the egalitarian nature of her approach to the issue. In addition, attention has been drawn to Jameson’s more philosophically nuanced approach to the pragmatism that she had first begun to explore in *The Pot Boils*, and to her consideration of how it might be used to steer an intellectual path between the vexed poles of utopianism and anti-humanism, idealism and materialism. Finally, in its reading of her intertextual response to both Carpenter and Lawrence, this chapter has noted Jameson’s recurring fear of invasion of the Self, whilst tracing the emergence of new preoccupations with a proto-

modernist 'universal subjectivity'; with a related solipsism; and with the consequent difficulty of reconciling the needs of Self and Other. In her next two novels, which are the subject of Chapter 5, Jameson would extend her intertextual engagement with Lawrence. In *The Clash*, she would enter into dialogue with a range of his texts in order to explore his celebration of both difference and relationship. Developing further her brief revolt against modernist misogyny in *The Pot Boils*, she would also challenge the growing misogyny within Lawrence's work. Finally, in the more aesthetically focused *Pitiful Wife*, she would experiment with two different gothic modes found within Lawrence's work as a means of taking into account – whilst refusing to resolve – the contradiction between ideal and material aspects of human experience.

Chapter 5

Violence, Difference, Women and the Gothic: Writing Back to D. H. Lawrence in *The Clash* (1922) and *The Pitiful Wife* (1923)

Introduction

In *Journey*, Jameson describes her life during the period in which *The Clash* and *The Pitiful Wife* were written (1919–1923) as ‘a vacant lot between crowded streets’ (JNI 147). A major rupture occurred in January 1919 when, following Clarke’s transfer to Canterbury, she made the painful decision to leave her son in Whitby in order to take a job as a copy-editor in London. In October 1919 she moved from this job to become *de facto* editor of a mystical socialist journal called the *New Commonwealth*. The journal had been founded in the faith that post-war reconstruction could bring about a more equitable society but the untenable nature of its political idealism was apparent to Jameson from the start.¹ She attempted to use the journal to raise awareness of the plight of ‘Europe’s famished children’, but eventually bowed out as the politically hopeful Triple Alliance of miners, railwaymen and transport workers collapsed in March 1921 (JNI 156).

As well as abandoning her child for what turned out to be an unsatisfactory working life, Jameson was faced with a marriage that was now finally and irrevocably falling apart. Already in June 1918, whilst stationed with Clarke and their baby son in Hampshire, she had begun an unconsummated but sexually charged affair with a Texan airman (referred to in *Journey* as ‘J’), the only episode in her life, she felt, that deserved to be called ‘an affair of passion’ (JNI 118). The affair lasted, on and off, into the summer of 1919 when – held back by her four-year old son, by what she herself saw as an irrational instinct in favour of marital fidelity, and by fear of the unknown – Jameson decided against divorcing Clarke and going to live with the Texan in America. Since she and Clarke had been living apart

1 ‘By 1921 the [National Government’s] reforms in housing, education and agriculture had been abandoned or curtailed for the sake of financial retrenchment’ (Pugh 182) and ‘the economy was in a slump which, measured by the number of people out of work, was as bad as any in the records’ (Lloyd 91).

since his transfer to Canterbury at the end of October 1918, Jameson thus condemned herself to a lonely if irreproachable life until he joined her in London – having been reluctantly demobbed – in late 1920. It was not until late summer in 1921 that Jameson finally discovered that Clarke had himself been having a prolonged and fully consummated affair begun soon after his arrival in Canterbury. Despite her awareness that her marriage was less than perfect, this news came as a complete surprise to Jameson, turning her world upside down and dealing a devastating blow to her self-esteem.

On a more positive note, Jameson found some sort of substitute for the sense of belonging she had experienced as a member of that pre-war ‘foreign body with four heads’ (the Harland brothers, Archie White and herself), when her publisher and friend, Michael Sadleir, introduced her to the cultural circle surrounding the editor of the *Saturday Westminster*, Naomi Royde-Smith, a year or so after her arrival in London (JNI 66). Royde-Smith herself was a northerner from Halifax and those she drew round her were mostly professional writers of provincial or lower-middle class origin, who, like Jameson, had not been born into the southern metropolitan culture in which they found themselves.² It is, indeed, a significant insight into 1920s London that it was Sadleir, the son of the Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University, Michael Sadler, who gave Jameson what was, in effect, her second *entrée* into a metropolitan coterie (and who had agreed to publish her first novel, about students from a northern university). Her first *entrée* (which she had refused) had also come from a northerner, namely the Mancunian Dora Marsden.

Described by Virginia Woolf as ‘a queer mixture of the intelligent and the respectable ... of ideas and South Kensington’ (*Diary* II 122–3), the members of Royde-Smith’s circle

2 Members of Royde-Smith’s circle included Arnold Bennett, Frank Swinnerton, Walter de la Mare, John Middleton Murry, and possibly another ex-student from Leeds, Thomas Moul, as well Eddie Marsh, J. D. Beresford and Rose Macaulay, who had stronger links with the cultural centre. For Jameson’s friendship with both Swinnerton and de la Mare, see JNI, 164–6. For her friendship with de la Mare, see also Whistler, 316–17. In *Journey* I, Jameson also quotes from a letter from 1953 in which Murry recalls first meeting her at the Beresfords’ and feels that it is ‘somehow wrong that I should have entirely lost contact with you’ (193). There are six letters from Jameson to Murry, four of them dated 1923, in the John Middleton Murry Papers.

were well-informed about modernist theory and practice without necessarily being modernist practitioners. Foremost amongst them was Arnold Bennett, who – despite Woolf’s caricature of him as an old-fashioned literary materialist – had championed the work of Dostoevsky, Henry James, Valéry, Remy de Gourmont and Chekhov, among others, in his regular column for the *New Age* before the war (1908–1911) and who had hailed Post-Impressionism as a creative force capable of transforming contemporary literary techniques (Martin 84–96, 118–19). Other members of the circle had also contributed to the *New Age* on occasion, including Sadleir (writing as M. T. H. Sadler), John Middleton-Murry and Frank Swinnerton. Many, too, had been contributors to Murry’s pre-war little magazines, *Rhythm* (1911–1912) and *The Blue Review* (May–July 1913), both of which had been well-informed about avant-garde developments in European arts and letters and had had the modernist short-story writer, Katherine Mansfield, as their foremost contributor.³ Sadleir, whom Jameson described as a ‘flawed rebel’, had also translated Kandinsky’s *Über Das Geistige* in 1914 and was an important collector of modernist art (JNI 159).

On the other hand, the group was also an important seed-bed for anti-Bloomsbury feeling in ‘the Battle of the Brows’ that was just beginning and that would run on into the 1930s. In this vein, it produced not only Bennett’s criticism of Woolf’s inability to create convincing characters, but also Swinnerton’s later critical attack both on Woolf and on the Bloomsbury group as a whole.⁴ Although Bethel Rigel Daugherty correctly discerns a conflict between Woolf’s feminism and Bennett’s sexism, her diagnosis of Bennett’s reflections on class as a strategic red herring entirely fails to recognise the difference of perspective that came from being a meritocratic outsider-insider within the domain of early

3 *Rhythm* had been funded by Sadler at his son’s behest. Contributors from Naomi Royde-Smith’s circle included de la Mare, Swinnerton, Beresford, Sadleir and Murry himself. Lawrence contributed ‘The Georgian Renaissance’ to *Rhythm* and ‘The Soiled Rose’ and ‘German Books’ to the *Blue Review*.

4 Bennett’s criticisms appeared in ‘Is the Novel Decaying?’ (March 1923); Swinnerton’s attack, in Chapter 13 of *The Georgian Literary Scene* (1938). See also, Woolf’s Diary entry for 19 Feb. 1923, in which she talks of Royde-Smith as her ‘foe’ and admits to ‘pulling strings’ to ‘unseat’ her, presumably from the *Saturday Westminster* (Diary II 236).

twentieth century metropolitan culture (285). Although the outsider-insider worlds of the *New Age* and of Royde-Smith's circle were by no means synonymous, there were points of view in common, one of these being the degree to which aesthetic issues were seen as bound up with social and political ones. There was also the very real economic insecurity that faced many of these highly intelligent writers and that may have deterred them from making overtly radical literary experiments. For all these reasons, perhaps, Jameson began to identify herself with this new circle and went on to produce her own salvoes against Bloomsbury in *Lady Susan and Life: An Indiscretion* (1923) and *Three Kingdoms* (1926).⁵

In this chapter it is argued that each of the two novels that follow *The Happy Highways* is based on a phase of Jameson's personal life around this time. *The Clash* is a semi-autobiographical version of her affair with her American lover and her rejection of him in favour of her apparently loyal English husband; *The Pitiful Wife* a semi-autobiographical version of her subsequent discovery of betrayal by that same husband.⁶ In both novels Jameson develops the pragmatic approach she had already begun to establish – testing her experience against philosophical, political and literary ideas and those ideas against her experience – but, having put her pre-war extremism firmly behind her, the focus in these novels is less retrospective than previously. Seeking a new, post-war cultural position with which to identify, she now engages in dialogue with the work of a contemporary, namely D. H. Lawrence.

Which of Lawrence's published writings had Jameson read by the time she wrote *The Clash* and *The Pitiful Wife* and why was his work so important to her at this point in her literary career? These are the questions addressed in the first section of this chapter on the intellectual and cultural background to Jameson's intertextual dialogue with Lawrence. The section begins by exploring how Jameson's membership of Royde-Smith's circle created

5 For a discussion of these texts, see Chapter 6.

6 Jameson also wrote two neatly ironical semi-autobiographical pieces based on the reversal of the balance of power in her relationship with her husband, a short story also entitled 'The Pitiful Wife' (1922) and an aptly named one-act play, *Full Circle* (1928).

multiple indirect links between her and Lawrence. Information is then given as to which Lawrence texts Jameson had read by this stage and these texts are categorised in terms of the different developmental phases of his writing. The remainder of this section examines those aspects of Lawrence's work that were of particular interest to Jameson at around this time – his intense awareness of the human capacity for violence and consequent criticism of liberal idealism, his 'ethics of alterity' or valuing of Otherness, his changing view of women, and the two types of gothic (the Brontëan and the Ruskinian) that informed his work – and it explores some of the reasons for that interest (Sargent and Watson 413).⁷

In 'A Feminist Dialogue with Lawrence's "Ethics of Alterity" in *The Clash*', it is argued that in the latter novel Jameson uses the device of semi-autobiographical intertextual fiction to bring her real-life rejection of her American lover to the bar of Lawrence's 'ethics of alterity' and Lawrence's 'ethics of alterity' to the bar of her experience *as a woman*. In so doing, Jameson weighs the positive value of the latter ethics against Lawrence's growing misogyny. Although no firm conclusion is reached, the novel's re-evaluation of the specific social and political advantages of idealism for woman-as-social-Other offers a thought-provoking counterweight both to Lawrence's post-war primitivism and to her own youthful critique of liberal idealism as depicted in *The Happy Highways*.

The final section of this chapter, 'Jameson Reading Lawrence Reading the Brontë Sisters and Ruskin in *The Pitiful Wife*', is comprised of two separate readings of that novel. The first of these reads it as a female-centred psychological journey in which Jael, the unicorn of chastity from Lawrence's 'Crown', must discover the lion of materialism within her own psyche, that is to say, an uncanny 'difference' within the ideal Self. In her intertextual mapping of this journey, it is argued, Jameson also draws on Lawrence's critique of Ruskin's idealist view of women and on his reading of Brontëan gothic as an

7 The present writer agrees with Simpson's and Nixon's view that Lawrence's attitude to women deteriorated somewhere between 1915 and 1918. For a more generally negative view, see the early critiques of de Beauvoir, 278–82, and Millet, 237–57. For attempts to rehabilitate Lawrence's reputation amongst feminists, see Gilbert, Siegel, and Sargent and Watson.

exploration of the dark side of the female Self. The second reading of *The Pitiful Wife* focuses on the aesthetic journey of Jael's husband, the sculptor Richmond. Again this journey is mapped intertextually, this time by replicating Lawrence's contradictory relationship with Ruskin. Like Lawrence, Richmond moves away from Ruskin's enthusiasm for the idealist perfection of the Renaissance and towards his championing of the hybrid imperfection of gothic architecture. In the developmental journeys of both the main characters in *The Pitiful Wife*, as in Lawrence's own reading of history, the Great War is the catalyst which shatters the dream of idealism and forces change.

Intellectual and Cultural Background

Once one begins to look for them, the links between Lawrence and the Royde-Smith circle are striking. Eddie Marsh, the editor of *Georgian Poetry*, had been an early and important patron of Lawrence's as well as a kind friend.⁸ Walter de la Mare, who had first encountered Lawrence in his capacity as Reader for Heinemann, had acted as an 'unofficial agent' for him during his absence from England just before the war (Whistler 194). Although far more emotionally and sexually reserved than Lawrence, de la Mare recognized in him 'a remarkable new imagination' and had written largely favourable reviews of *Love Poems and Others* and *The Rainbow* (Whistler 194). Arnold Bennett, who would later describe Lawrence as 'the strongest novelist writing today' (Draper 108), had been the only well-known author to stand up for *The Rainbow* in public, had lent Lawrence money and, at around this time, also offered practical help over the publication of *Women in Love* (Kinkead-Weekes 285). In July 1921, Frank Swinnerton, similarly, wrote one of only two positive contemporary reviews of *Women in Love* (WIL liv), while from early 1918 to 1922 Sadleir was in correspondence with Lawrence, requesting first poetry and then a story, 'The Wintry Peacock', for collections he was editing (Kinkead-Weekes 428, 565). Finally, a more

⁸ See Kinkead-Weekes, 85–6, 150–1, 814.

mixed view of Lawrence may have come through Middleton Murry, whose relationship with him was particularly rocky around this time.⁹

For the purposes of the discussion that follows, the Lawrence texts with which Jameson was familiar can be broken down into three developmental phases, with ‘The Crown’ acting as a transition piece between the second and third phase. To the first phase belong *The White Peacock* (1911), *The Trespasser* (1912) and, very likely, *Sons and Lovers* (1913), novels in which Lawrence is preoccupied with the previously discussed concept of the ‘peacock’ or idealist woman that had influenced Jameson’s first novel, *The Pot Boils*. To the second phase belong at least two of the stories collected in *The Prussian Officer* (1914), together with *The Rainbow* (1914).¹⁰ In these women-centred narratives, the heroines are mostly shown connecting with the non-human power of the universe – in a profoundly Carpenterian manner – by opening up to a sexual Other and thus bringing about their own spiritual transformation and contributing to that of society as a whole. The third phase is comprised of most, if not all, of the *English Review* essays on classic American literature (1918–June 1919), *The Lost Girl* (1920) and *Women in Love* (published in England in 1921).¹¹ In this increasingly primitivist and misogynistic phase, women’s heterosexual desire is frequently regarded with real disgust and Lawrence begins to explore a new ‘oriental’ social model (*LG* 389), in which ‘man must take the lead’ in ‘the creative union between man and woman’ (*SCAL* 411). Furthermore, this oriental model is associated with a nascent proto-

9 See Worthen, *Outsider*, 222–4. On 4 December 1923, Jameson wrote to Murry asking him to send on to Lawrence a letter from herself as Knopf’s representative. Another connection linking Jameson to Lawrence was Thomas Moul, an old student friend from Leeds for whom she had engineered a job at the *New Commonwealth* in late 1919 (letter to Moul, 26 November 1919), and who had met and commissioned work from Lawrence in his capacity as editor of *Voices* in the summer of that same year (Kinkead-Weekes 511).

10 For internal evidence that Jameson had read ‘Goose Fair’ and ‘The Second Best’, see below.

11 Hereafter Lawrence’s *English Review* essays on classic American literature are referred to as *Studies*. For internal evidence that Jameson had read *Studies*, *LG* and *WIL*, see below. For a reference to the lapis lazuli episode in *WIL*, see *Lady Susan*, 148. This third phase can helpfully be regarded as part of a longer ‘primitive’ phase that continued with texts like *Aaron’s Rod* (1922) and *The Plumed Serpent* (1926). A witty summary of *Aaron’s Rod* in *Lady Susan* (148) is evidence that Jameson also read that novel soon after its publication.

Fascism that glamorizes the domination of the weak by the strong as an inevitable Law of Nature.

Finally, there are the first three essays of 'The Crown' which were published serially in Lawrence and Murry's short-lived journal, *Signature* (October–November 1915).¹² According to Kinkead-Weekes, the complete 'Crown' (written in 1915) is a transitional work which reveals 'the author of *The Rainbow* visibly turning into the man who would write *Women in Love*' (269). It was at around the time he wrote it that Lawrence began to lose his utopianism and to emphasise 'the process of disintegration' that 'must follow consummation' (Kinkead-Weekes 270). The first two essays remain optimistic, advocating a series of meetings between the (genderless) opposites of the lion of materialism and the unicorn of idealism, and – while they do not underestimate either the difficulties or the impermanence of such meetings – are a lyrical celebration of 'difference' and of life as 'a leap taken, into the beyond' (RDP 262). The third essay focuses on the evil that occurs when fear of the process of disintegration causes the opposites of idealism and materialism (exemplified by English liberalism and Prussian militarism, respectively) to cease their dialogic to and fro and to become destructively trapped within their own partial truths.

Later, in the 1930s, influenced not only by historical developments but also by the case Wyndham Lewis made for Enlightenment values in *Time and Western Man* (1927), Jameson would condemn Lawrence in no uncertain terms for 'exalting the "warm living blood" above the intellect' and thus 'thr[o]w[ing] up his cap for the "dark gods" of Fascism' (CJ 230). She would also date the 'deformation' of Lawrence's work from around 1920, that is, shortly before she wrote *The Clash* (CJ 303–4). In the early 1920s, however, based on his extant work and on a less overtly threatening historical situation, Jameson's response to Lawrence was more positive. Whilst she was seriously concerned by some of the implications of his 'new psychology' (Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis* xxxiv), she was also deeply

12 Jameson may well have been lent copies of *Signature* after the war by a member of Royde-Smith's circle. Hereafter, the three *Signature* essays are referred to collectively as 'The *Signature* Crown'. 'The Crown' was first published in its entirety in RDP (1925).

attracted to much that he had written, not simply because she happened to find herself amongst a group of his admirers but for a number of intellectual, ethical and aesthetic reasons.

One important reason why Lawrence's writing spoke to Jameson with such immediacy in the early 1920s was that it conveyed the sense of historical crisis and cultural fissure that she herself had sought to express in *The Happy Highways*. 'His books', she later wrote, 'are alive with jostling shapes ... [but] under the seeming solidity of this creation we become aware of tremendous cracks, fissures into which it may disappear' (*CJ* 229–30). At least part of this sense of crisis came from a powerful new awareness of a persistent and fundamental dark side of the human psyche that had been revealed by the violence of war. Coming from the same pre-war utopian tradition as Lawrence, in which the animal and the rational in Man were to be mystically reconciled within a 'higher consciousness', Jameson shared with him the shock of this new awareness. In 'The Reality of Peace' (1915), for example, Lawrence appears, like Jameson in *The Happy Highways*, to be writing back to Carpenter's evolutionary-socialist theory of race-devils and race-deities when he argues that 'it is no use casting out devils. They belong to us' (*RDP* 35).¹³ In her 1932 essay, 'The Craft of the Novelist', Jameson cites Lawrence's literary representation of the human capacity for violence as a key reason for placing his work above that of a writer like Virginia Woolf, who whilst she may recognise that capacity in theory, chooses not to engage with it in practice:

You can say of Mrs. Woolf's novels that the action is little more than a fine skin, through which you trace a network of nerves charged with thoughts and feelings. In Lawrence's the action is intensely significant. It is emotion issuing in action – issuing, where there is conflict between two characters, with considerable violence. (*CJ* 72–3)

Although Jameson could not have known it, Lawrence's split with two other members of Bloomsbury – Bertrand Russell and, later, Ottoline Morrell – during the war, was caused, at

13 For Carpenter's theory and Jameson's mid-war response to it, see Ch. 1, pp. 45–6 and Ch. 4, p. 101.

least in part, by his similar sense of their spiritual idealism or refusal to look squarely at the violence both within themselves and within the culture to which they belonged.¹⁴

A second source of attraction for Jameson was what Sargent and Watson have called Lawrence's 'ethics of alterity', comparing this aspect of his writing to Martin Buber's 'bold swinging ... into the life of the other' (413, 416). Jameson draws attention to this ethical approach when she praises Lawrence for 'that unconscious unwilling integrity which ... compelled [him] to abandon himself wholly to an experience' (*CJ* 111), or when she quotes approvingly (on more than one occasion) his belief that the value of the novel derives from its capacity to 'lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness' (*Lady Chatterley* 101, qtd. in *CJ* 309 and *Writer's* 39). Such an approach is not the same as Carpenter's absorbent 'universal subjectivity', as discussed in the previous chapter, nor does it involve the modernist notion of the unifying presence of the artist who disappears behind his creation like a god. Instead, in Lawrence's best work it leads to a dialogical pluralism in which there is a sense of both Self and Other as different objects that are of equal interest and equally worthy of respect. Thus Jameson would praise Lawrence in her 1929 essay, 'The Decline of Fiction', as a writer who is 'drawn towards the object, whether the object is a young woman's yellow stocking, a meadow in June, or the phantasies of his own unconscious' (*CJ* 29). This dialogical pluralism could also apply to more theoretical issues, as it did, for example, in Lawrence's representation of the relationship between idealism and materialism in 'The *Signature Crown*'. Since this was a relationship that she had already begun to explore in her first two novels (and since this was perhaps Lawrence's last treatment of the theme in an ungendered form), 'The *Signature Crown*' was a text to which

14 For a discussion of Lawrence's split with Russell, see Kinkead-Weekes, 262–3. Jameson could have deduced something of Lawrence's objections to Ottoline Morrell from his portrait of her as Hermione Roddice in *WIL* as well as from gossip she may have heard.

Jameson was particularly attracted and which would function as a key intertext in both *The Clash* and *The Pitiful Wife*.

On the question of women, as in other areas, Jameson shared key formative influences with Lawrence. These included not only the class-based critique of the cultivated 'Other Woman' which both of them had derived from the *New Age* and which has been discussed in Chapter 3, but also the influence of Marsden's notion of self-liberation through spiritual, as opposed to political, means – and the personal experience, too, of having a strong (northern) mother.¹⁵ Now, at a time when she was breaking loose both from the influence of her mother and from the misogyny of the *New Age*, Jameson was attracted, and even inspired, by Lawrence's empathy with and foregrounding of women in the phase of his writing that included *The Rainbow*, immediately before the war. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, she was also profoundly concerned by the misogynistic primitivism of what for her was his most recent work.

On the question of aesthetics, it has already been mentioned how the sense of 'tremendous cracks' or 'fissures' 'under the seeming solidity' of Lawrence's imaginary world spoke to Jameson's own post-war perspective. The literary genre that best expresses the dark forces lurking beneath the civilised surface of life is that of gothic horror, and a number of critics have recently remarked on traces of this genre – and of a related expressionism – within Lawrence's writing.¹⁶ Quite apart from her exploration of Freud's uncanny (with its gothic associations) in *The Happy Highways*, Jameson, too, was interested in exploring aspects of this genre in the early 1920s, as were other members of Royde-Smith's circle. This interest is revealed in two articles written by Jameson at around this time on writers associated with the latter circle – one on the short stories of Katherine

15 For the influence of Marsden's philosophy of the 'freewoman' on Lawrence, see Simpson, 23.

16 For Lawrence's use of gothic tropes, see, for example, Hollington, Humma, Pinkney, Andrew Smith and Wilt, *Ghosts*.

Mansfield and the other on Walter de la Mare's *Memoirs of a Midget* (1921) – and in Michael Sadleir's pamphlet, *The Northanger Novels: A Footnote to Jane Austen* (1927), which re-evaluates gothic horror as a genre.¹⁷

Most revealing of the aforementioned critical texts is Jameson's perceptive review of de la Mare's novel, 'Mr. de la Mare and the Grotesque', which draws out the gothic traces that lurk beneath the surface elegance of its style.¹⁸ For Jameson, 'Miss M. shows often less like the elf she is than like an ordinary human being adrift in a world of monstrous appearances' (425). For her, too, sexual fear is a powerful subliminal theme within the novel. Miss M. is 'part a child' and '[her lover's] passion repels her because she dimly feels what the child guesses and the grown man forgets, that passion is a harsh, searing dream. She shrinks from the experience' (428). A final quotation will, perhaps, more effectively convey the dark expressionist or gothic quality of Jameson's reading of de la Mare's novel:

Sometimes, as in the story of Miss M's frenzied wandering, the dream deepens; the air is filled with the beating of wings, and in the hollow moon-filled sphere, a mad creature runs, always seeking, seeking. Again the dream wears thin, and once tears suddenly across, revealing an eyeless, terrified face. (429)

Jameson's article, 'The Genius of Katherine Mansfield', is also noteworthy for its singling out of 'The Little Governess' for particular praise. The latter is the disturbing story of a cultural outsider, an impoverished, socially inexperienced governess, on her first trip to Europe, who, like de la Mare's Midget, is 'adrift in a world of monstrous appearances'.

Together with certain of Lawrence's fictions such as *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, 'The Fox' and 'The Ladybird', de la Mare's *Memoirs* and Mansfield's story can be seen to contain traces of the type of gothic that Sadleir, in his pamphlet, associates with M. G. Lewis's *The*

17 Although Sadleir's study was written later than Jameson's articles, he had presumably been working on it for some years since he refers to the immense difficulty he had in discovering extant copies of the titles mentioned by Austen. Sadleir's interest in the gothic is also consistent with his early interest in expressionist art.

18 For a similar reading of the novel, see Angela Carter.

Monk (1796), namely one in which security is ‘a dream’ beneath which lurks an all-too-real horror (as opposed to the Radcliffian type in which terror is an indulgent thrill enjoyed from ‘the cosy security of home’),¹⁹ and, as such, they can be seen to reflect a modernity haunted by the materialist psychology of Freud and the brutality of the Great War (14). Yet there are also crucial differences between the gothic traces present within Lawrence’s work and those within *Memoirs* and ‘The Little Governess’. Lawrence’s Brontëan gothic traces evoke the horror located *within* the Self and represent it ‘not as horrible-bad, undesirable and destructive and to be expunged and destroyed, but rather as what is horrible-good, necessary and vital to be striven for’ (Humma 236). The gothic traces in *Memoirs* and ‘The Little Governess’, on the other hand, evoke a horror that is located *outside* the Self and they belong to that subgenre of the gothic which David Punter terms ‘persecutory’.²⁰ One example Punter gives of this type of gothic is William Godwin’s *Caleb Williams* (1794), a novel ‘overtly concerned with the problems of social interaction within a class-divided society, and with the injustice which that society is capable of meting out to the innocent’ (*Gothic* 117–8). According to Punter’s analysis of Godwin’s novel, ‘every step [Caleb] takes plunges him further into the toils of misery and persecution, since [his persecutor’s] power of retaliation is seemingly infinite’ (*Gothic* 119). Similarly the powerless ‘outsider’ heroines of both de la Mare’s novel and Mansfield’s short story are relentlessly driven out of ‘civilised’ society.

In a sense, Brontëan and persecutory gothic can be seen to reflect opposing facets of the same social coin, since while the former focuses on the Will-to-Power of a Self that is socially repressed, the latter focuses on the sufferings of the Self as social Other and hence

19 Ann Radcliffe’s two major novels were *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794) and *The Italian* (1797).

20 See Chapter 5, ‘The Dialectic of Persecution: *William Godwin*, *C.R. Matwin*, *James Hogg*’ (Punter, *Literature* 114–139).

as abjected victim of a more dominant Will-to-Power.²¹ It is possible to surmise that the interest in the latter type of gothic amongst certain members of Royde-Smith's circle was informed by personal experiences of social insecurity and marginality.²² In this context, it is significant that Murry later wrote to tell Jameson how delighted Mansfield had been, 'at a moment when she was feeling wretched', by Jameson's review 'of one of her stories' (presumably 'The Little Governess') for – doubly disadvantaged by their social origins (provincial in Jameson's case, colonial in Mansfield's) and by their gender – both women knew what it was like to be on the receiving end of the symbolic violence of a masculinist, metropolitan culture (JNI 192).²³ While in *The Pitiful Wife* Jameson experiments with Lawrence's Brontëan gothic, she would go on to explore the subgenre of persecutory gothic in *Three Kingdoms*.

A second source of aesthetic interest for Jameson in Lawrence's writing is its formal imperfection, which – perhaps surprisingly – may be seen to have something in common with the aesthetic hybridity and warmly alive imperfection of the early Wells which Jameson so admired in *The Pot Boils*. Formal imperfection is another characteristic that revisionary critics of Lawrence's writing have drawn attention to of late and that has been linked to questions of identity and difference.²⁴ In his recent book, *D. H. Lawrence and Difference*, Amit Chaudhuri explores, for example, how in his poetry Lawrence develops an aesthetic of 'imperfection' or 'unfinishedness' that allows space for cultural difference and he traces this aesthetic back to the influence of Ruskin's 'The Nature of the Gothic' in particular (198). In Jameson's *The Happy Highways*, as discussed in Chapter 4, assimilation of

21 Both these types of gothic should be distinguished from what Judith Wilt has called the 'modern fear of the death of our most cherished illusion – ego, the self' ('Ghost' 62).

22 Although Lawrence's use of gothic is generally less paranoiac, there is a significantly similar sense of not-belonging and of the potential threat of others attributed to the semi-autobiographical Birkin in *WIL*: 'What a dread he had of mankind, of other people! It amounted almost to horror, to a sort of dream terror' (108).

23 For a discussion of Mansfield's experience of such treatment, see Jaffe, 103–4.

24 See, for example, Eggert, 173–4; Fernihough, *D.H. Lawrence*; and Lodge, 57–74.

a southern metropolitan idealism initially leads the narrator, Joy, to repress his own cultural difference, but later he approves of Chamberlayn's fighting for 'the second best, undeterred by its imperfections' (277). The phrase 'second best' – which Jameson would use again at a key moment in *The Pitiful Wife* – alludes to Lawrence's short story of that name, in which the educated heroine chooses a 'second best' life with an uneducated but kindly husband when she discovers her dream of an educated soul-mate to have been an illusion.²⁵ Philosophy and aesthetics come together in Lawrence's story in his depiction of the trapped mole which is the memorable objective correlative for the heroine's 'second best' future life. With its ill-assorted 'velvet shoulders', 'sightless face' and 'flat, pink hands', the mole is described as a grotesque hybrid, yet one that is not without both moral and aesthetic value, being sensitively alive and, in its own way, 'the very ghost of *joie de vivre*' (*Prussian* 120). Lawrence's mole, and his Ruskinian gothic aesthetic in general, produce in the reader a sense of Bhaba's "'in-between" spaces' that is also suggested in a more sentimentally comic manner by Wells's Mr. Polly and even by Jameson's own Poskett in *The Pot Boils*. Jameson's first two novels also contain some of the ill-assorted crossings 'between linguistic and social registers, between literary genres and traditions, between whole discourses and disciplines' that Ann Fernihough discerns in Lawrence's work (and that, incidentally, Wells confesses to in his 'Note to the Reader' at the opening of *A Modern Utopia*) (Fernihough, *Cambridge Companion* 2–3).

A Feminist Dialogue with Lawrence's 'Ethics of Alterity' in *The Clash*

My distrustful awkward nature, as ashamed of its hopes as of its passions, is the very opposite of [Lawrence's]. (*CJ* 245–6)

Victoria ... wants to persuade us that ... [h]ealth, happiness, civilization itself, depends on all able-bodied persons leading ... 'dark and sacral' lives ... you may see that I am annoyed

25 In *The Pitiful Wife*, the phrase occurs in a context which is very similar to that of Lawrence's story, namely when the heroine finally faces up to the fact that she must get used to 'the second best for always' in her marriage (310).

by the notion that my life is less full than Victoria's merely because I do not enjoy a 'blood-awareness' (another technically correct term) of my gardener. (Jameson, *Delicate* 29–30)

In *The Clash*, influenced most likely by Lawrence's *The Rainbow*, for the first time in her work Jameson places a woman character centre-stage. In the foreground is the story of the semi-autobiographical Elizabeth Marwood, a northern New Woman come south shortly before the Great War. In the background is the wider picture of England and Europe before and during the war as depicted in Lawrence's 'Signature Crown', namely as living through a period of cultural stasis in which 'no creation takes place' (Kinkead-Weekes 269). Yet, as in *The Rainbow*, great weight is placed on the spiritual journey of the New Woman who is open to the Other and who is, therefore, an important potential growing point in the process that leads from personal to social renewal. Here Jameson appears to be taking Lawrence's message in *The Rainbow* to heart and feeling a sense of responsibility *as a woman* for the future development of society. *The Clash* is divided into two parts, with inter-textual reference not only to *The Rainbow* but also to 'The Signature Crown' occurring throughout. In 'Part I – Seed-Time', the authorial voice broadly agrees with Lawrence's diagnosis of Liberal England as trapped within its own idealism and with his gendered association of that idealism first and foremost with the cultivated woman – in this case, the novel's semi-autobiographical heroine, Elizabeth. In 'Part II – Harvest', Jameson introduces a materialist Other in the form of the American, Jess Cornish – a semi-fictional version of her own American lover, 'J' – as a means of interrogating both her own sexual cautiousness and Lawrence's writing. In the narrative that follows, Jameson develops an intertextual dialogue with 'The Signature Crown', *Studies*, *The Lost Girl* and *Women in Love*, in particular, in which Lawrence's honesty regarding the dark side of the human psyche and his 'ethics of alterity', on the one hand, are set against his recent gender-bias and proto-fascism, on the other.

Bearing the ironical Lawrentian title, 'Seed-time', the picture Jameson paints in Part I of *The Clash* conforms with Lawrence's notion of pre-war England as a static and sterile idealist society on the verge of collapse, and of the role of gender-relations in contributing

to this crisis. In this first part of the novel, Elizabeth is all of Lawrence's dreaming or 'peacock' women rolled into one. Indeed the peacock becomes a metaphor for her dreams (64). Like the upbringing of *The Lost Girl's* heroine, Alvina Houghton, Elizabeth's old-fashioned training as a young lady symbolizes a wider cultural stasis: just as Alvina 'had the old, womanly faculty' to 'sit still, for days, months, and years – perforce to sit still, with some dignity of tranquil bearing' (*LG* 58), Elizabeth has been taught 'to sit still ... upright and stiff as a poker for hours', cultivating a 'placid grace' (*Clash* 177).

As in the case both of the Lawrentian peacock women and of the liberal males in Jameson's first two novels, Elizabeth inverts the neo-platonic model, using her high culture as a screen against material reality:

The child [Elizabeth] seized on those phrases of winged light and they became for her pure and changeless forms, shielding her from the immensity of the sky. She hid behind them as behind a hedge of upthrust spears and the colours of life were reflected from that dazzling surface. (21)

The trope of the reflecting surface here also recalls Birkin's comparison of the cultured and upper-class Hermione Roddice in *Women in Love* to the Lady of Shalott, who watches life through a mirror rather than engaging with it directly: 'You've got that mirror, ... your immortal understanding ... and there is nothing beyond it' (42).²⁶ As in the case of Lawrence's Miriam (*Sons and Lovers*) and young Ursula (*The Rainbow*), Elizabeth's idealism is represented as a form of narcissism; she is trapped in a self-conscious fantasy world in which she dreams of herself as a virginal Pre-Raphaelite heroine representing a flawless and unnatural virtue or desire to be 'good' (*Clash* 177; Lawrence, *Sons* 177; *R* 265). Recalling those 'within the closed shell of the Christian conception' in the third essay of 'The Signature Crown' (*RDP* 277), Elizabeth also assuages the guilt of her indifference to others by a hollow philanthropy.²⁷

26 Jameson would apply the Lady of Shalott analogy to her own fictional version of Ottoline Morrell, Lady Muriel Verschott (*Lady* 118), and to Virginia Woolf ('Review' 678).

27 Beside the multiple intertextual references to Lawrence here, it is worth recalling Jameson's own early concerns regarding the tendencies of Art to produce too much 'self-introspection' in 'The Unreality of Art'.

The influence of Lawrence's 'peacock woman' on representations of class and culture in *The Pot Boils* has been discussed in Chapter 3. In *The Clash*, however, Jameson also draws on Lawrence's more essentialist notion of the Magna Mater whose desire for control is read as a misdirected biological drive that has got dangerously out of hand. Recalling Lettie Beardsall's marriage to the injured Leslie Temple in *The White Peacock* and Helena's relationship with the unmasterful Siegmund in *The Trespasser*, the dreaming Elizabeth chooses to marry the effete upper-class Englishman Jamie Denham - who is not only physically lame, but a Guild Socialist to boot - in preference to other more virile lovers, because his diminished masculine Otherness poses less of a threat to her desire for control. The connection between this desire and Elizabeth's female biology is suggested in an account of her thoughts and feelings as she contemplates Jamie's sleeping form on the first morning of their life together:

He was helpless, a child held between her breasts. She possessed him utterly ... Fulfilled of his love, she bore him as a mother her child. The fierce passion of the mother lapped her round with fire. He stirred ... Through his wakening eyes would look the stranger she had married. Her child would be separated from her, life ebbing from her body to become an alien life ... (*Clash* 89)

Maternal love fills the gap where sexual love should be because, like Helena in Lawrence's *The Trespasser*, sex for Elizabeth in this first part of the novel remains safely 'in the head' (Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis* 117) – 'You do not know what passion is ... It is your imagination that inflames you', observes her great-aunt Miriam (*Clash* 213). As in her application of Freud's theories to her semi-autobiographical narrator in *The Happy Highways*, Jameson appears here to use Lawrence's psychological theories to analyse her own experience through fiction. This time her focus is on her relationship with her weak first husband, and, yet again, she discovers in herself that desire for control that she so much feared and distrusted.²⁸

Just as in Lawrence's '*Signature Crown*' the 'seed of light, of the spirit' must remain 'sterile' if unfertilised by the 'darkness' of sensual materialism (*RDP* 267), so Part I of *The*

28 For Jameson's relationship with Clarke as one of maternal control on her part and of child-like dependence on his, see, for example, *JNI* 167–8 and 222.

Clash ends with the death of Elizabeth and Jamie's first and only child or 'seed' after just three weeks of life. The notion that the child's death is the product of its parents' over-developed idealism is confirmed by an arresting image of the dying baby in his mother's arms: 'On one white breast he laid his tiny hand, outspread like a flower' (*Clash* 98). This image alludes to the 'new psychology' Lawrence had begun to develop in *Studies* in which the 'breast' is 'the centre of our dynamical spiritual consciousness' (*SCAL* 193). However, the 'dynamical sensual consciousness' of the bowels, which is equally important within Lawrence's theory, is entirely lacking in the environment into which the Denhams' baby is born (*SCAL* 193). Like the failure of Lawrence's human cabbages to shed their outer leaves and release new growth in 'The *Signature Crown*', the failure of this child-flower to open symbolises a wider social malaise.²⁹

In 'Part II – Harvest', the sensual side of Lawrence's 'new psychology' comes to the fore. In *Studies*, Lawrence began to look to America for a cultural renewal he no longer felt Europe was capable of generating for itself and in the aboriginal American he saw an example of 'the dark, sensual self' which he was seeking (*SCAL* 193). Similarly in Jameson's 'Harvest' a new American character – who, though white, is associated with the sensual self – enters the scene, seemingly offering a way out of stasis. This is Jess Cornish, a Texan pilot brought to England by the Great War, who is a combination of the Texan airman with whom Jameson had an unconsummated affair in real-life and Lawrence's aboriginal American in *Studies*. As in Lawrence's 'new psychology', Cornish represents 'the burning source of sensual consciousness' that lies 'within the bowels' and 'draw[s] all things into [itself]' (*SCAL* 193). A 'charming barbarian', he 'walks with a swing from the hips' and is 'a fire that sucks everything to itself' (*Clash* 113, 174). He also has the 'arrogance and pugnacity' of the primeval birds in Lawrence's essay on Crèvecoeur (*SCAL* 198). As such,

29 As Jameson would have been aware, Lawrence's human cabbages are an inversion of Carpenter's theory of exfoliation. Thus he warns that 'we have enclosed ourselves in our own exfoliation' (*RDP* 272). For an account of Carpenter's theory, see Chapter 1, p. 39.

Cornish represents ‘the greater inhuman forces that control us’ (*SCAL* 170). ‘That which we regard as nothing, that which is our pre-cerebral cognition’ is manifest in his ‘void annihilating stare’ (*SCAL* 205; *Clash* 173). The combination of his name and provenance also recalls the laconic ‘Cornish-Yankee’ hero of Lawrence’s story ‘Samson and Delilah’ who – like Jameson’s student anarchists in *The Happy Highways* – believes ‘it’s no good calling things by any names whatsoever’ and who dominates his neglected and mutinous wife by the sheer power of his sexual magnetism (Lawrence, *Selected* 286).³⁰

Jameson also makes inter-textual reference to Lawrence’s psychic geography in *Studies* in her account of Cornish’s Cornish forbears.³¹ Indeed Cornish’s symbolic Lawrentian role as one who is untouched by the post-Renaissance humanism of Europe is overdetermined to the point of parody. In conformity with Lawrence’s psychic geography, Cornish’s forebears as Celts have ‘remained outside the European circuit’ (*SCAL* 172). Once in America, they have moved – like Ishmael in Lawrence’s reading of Fenimore Cooper’s *The Prairie* – from the Atlantic seaboard which ‘lies under the spell of Europe’ to ‘the vast horizons’ of Kentucky (*SCAL* 172; *Clash* 110). As a consequence, just as Lawrence imagines how ‘the subtlest plasm’ of the pioneers ‘was changed under the radiation of new skies, new influences of light’ (*SCAL* 178), so under the ‘illimitable skies’ of the American West, Cornish’s pioneer ancestors develop ‘new eyes, behind which a new mind stirred’ (*Clash* 110). In both instances, where once there had been a historical connection between Englishman and American, ‘in the pure present and futurity’ the contemporary American and the contemporary Englishman are divided by ‘untranslatable otherness’ (*SCAL* 168). Thus Jamie Denham finds that ‘he could not answer Cornish because the other man spoke a different tongue’ and, conversely, to Cornish Elizabeth – and by implication England – ‘was a story he had known once and forgotten’ (*Clash* 118, 179). Elizabeth summarises the situation thus: ‘We do not understand you and you do not understand us’ (*Clash* 241).

30 ‘Samson and Delilah’ was first published in the *English Review* in March 1917.

31 Jameson is likely to have been aware of Lawrence’s own connection with Cornwall since she was friends with J. D. Beresford who had lent the Lawrences his holiday house in Porthcothan before they moved to Zennor in March 1916.

In 'Harvest', the encounter between Elizabeth, the dreaming Englishwoman, and Cornish, the sensual American Other, is the 'clash' of the novel's title. A 'clash' between two cultures, it is also the 'clash' between the unicorn of an ideal chastity and the lion of sensual darkness in Lawrence's '*Signature Crown*'.³² In the latter text, Lawrence emphasizes his sense of a spiritual vacuum or 'want' within modernity by his reiteration of the word 'hollow'; in *The Clash* Elizabeth and Cornish – both of whom are lacking in their different ways – first encounter one another at the symbolically named aerodrome, 'Hollow Down'.³³ As in Lawrence's '*Signature Crown*', if creation is to take place, each side must take a 'leap ... into the beyond' of the Other (RDP 262). In addition, the plot of Jameson's novel revisions the plot of Lawrence's *The Lost Girl*, since Elizabeth, like Lawrence's Alvina (and like Jameson herself), must decide whether to go to live with her foreign lover in an alien land. As mentioned earlier, her response to these challenges is presented in terms that are profoundly dialogic.

The pro-Lawrentian side of this dialogue is informed by a psychological materialism that is suggested in an argument between Elizabeth and Cornish in which Elizabeth clings desperately to an idealised, Carpenterian notion of 'free love' – resembling that of the pre-war students in *The Happy Highways* – in the face of Cornish's psychological and sexual materialism:

'But suppose there were no jealousy and no possessive greed –
'You are talking of angels – who can suffer no torments of the body'.
...
'Or Utopia? But Americans are too well settled to dream of Utopias, I think'.
'Utopia has been bounded in one man's brain before now, but only one man dwelt
therein and had bad dreams'.

She was startled. What had lent him wit? (*Clash* 200)

Cornish's dismissal here of Carpenter's utopian model of free love – with its failure to recognize the possibility of negative consequences – is supported by the text as a whole in

32 Variants on the word 'clash' occur six times within three pages in '*The Signature Crown*' (RDP 259–61)

33 Variants on the word 'hollow' occur twelve times in '*The Signature Crown*'. Where Lawrence gives particular emphasis to this concept, he also uses the synonyms 'void' (7 times), 'bottomless pit' (8 times), 'want' (twice), 'vacuum', and 'abyss' (RDP 254, 274–5).

which, as in Lawrence's most recent post-war work, desire is represented as an amoral 'unseen force', 'as blind and insatiable as the earth' (*Clash* 202, 272). Thus at one point Cornish 'did not know whether he kissed [Elizabeth] for love or hate', while, at another, Elizabeth explains to her great-aunt: 'It's not the happiness one knows. It is more terrible' (*Clash* 213, 233).

As an idealist 'dreaming' woman, Elizabeth's response to Cornish's sexual power echoes Alvina's response to Cicio in *The Lost Girl*, and Gudrun's response to Gerald in *Women in Love*. It also reflects Jameson's own response to her American lover in real life (JNL 124, 149). Elizabeth's sexual arousal threatens her will so that she is in danger of losing all sense of Self and being transported into a realm not only beyond convention but beyond rationality. As in the encounters between Lawrence's paired lovers, key descriptors are 'crushed' and 'lost', while a key trope is that of the unconscious as a flood:³⁴

The blood in her veins was a consuming fire: she was crushed, she was nothing ... the fierce pressure of his body annihilated her. (*Clash* 185)

She shuddered involuntarily at the touch of his hands: her mind lay crushed and asleep under the burden of her ecstasy. (*Clash* 203)

Elizabeth sought in a kind of frenzy for her lost self.... Her thoughts were lethargic and confused. She scurried about behind them like a man building in the darkness with his back to advancing floods. The murmur of the waters was in her ears ... (*Clash* 205)

As in Gudrun's sexual relationship with Gerald in the final chapters of *Women in Love*, Elizabeth succeeds in holding Cornish at arms length psychologically – deceiving him by making love to him whilst using her conscious mind to resist the power he has over her, opposing 'a quivering point of malice' against the flood of unconsciousness (*Clash* 205–6). Yet, like Gudrun who longs to bridge this 'awful, inhuman distance which would always be interposed between her and the other being' (WIL 346), part of Elizabeth also wants to 'escape the surveillance of [her] mind' (*Clash* 188).

34 See, for example, LG 212, 244, 279 and WIL 330, 343, 402, 444.

Unlike Gudrun, Elizabeth does at one point succeed in overcoming the distance between Self and Other in a moment of union that alludes to Lawrence's symbolic description of the meeting between idealism and materialism in the first essay of his 'Signature Crown'. In this essay, Lawrence repeatedly uses the sea to symbolize the meeting between opposites. The "'in-between" space' where such opposites meet is symbolised by the shore-line where 'the ocean foams on the land, and the land *rushes down* into the sea' and by the 'foam' that appears where 'two tides' 'clash' (italics added, RDP 259–60). Together with the 'wind', the 'foam' also symbolises the impermanence of such meetings: 'We say the foam is evanescent, the wind passes over it and it is gone' (RDP 261). In addition, Lawrence's meeting of opposites is seen in terms of light and dark: 'the light projecting itself into the darkness, the darkness enveloping herself within the embrace of light' (RDP 259). Yet Lawrence's symbolism also suggests the new growth to which such meetings give rise: 'out of the dark, original flame issues' and 'the little yellow disk gleams absolute between heaven and earth ... a weed ... bursting into blossom'(RDP 262–3).

The moment of union between Elizabeth and Cornish in *The Clash* is, similarly, associated with the sea, taking place - like the *Trespasser* episode in *The Happy Highways* - on the north coast. More precisely, it takes place in the "'in-between" space' of a gully, in which - echoing Lawrence's language above - '[the] sea *rushed down* between the narrow walls' 'that led down to the shore' (italics added, 208–9). Emphasizing the notion of the gully as an "'in-between" space', we are also told that, there, 'the wind leaped *between* the steel-bright waters and the sky' (italics added, 208). As in the Lawrence passage, there is a collocation of the words 'foam', 'clash' and 'wind', symbolising both the meeting between opposites and its impermanence: 'Drifts of foam filled [the gully], ... blown of the wind and shaken of the surf that clashed and fell' (208). As in 'The *Signature Crown*', too, the meeting is, equally, seen in terms of the opposites of light and dark: at dusk, we are told, 'darkness, drawing down the ... heavens, left one thin gleam of light above the sea's rim' (208–9). Finally, although more tentatively than in the Lawrence, there is an equally

important symbolic suggestion of the potential for new growth in the appearance of ‘a crocus-yellow flame *between* the sundering clouds’ (italics added, 209).

Standing in the gully ‘ankle-deep in foam’, Elizabeth and Cornish have a primeval moment of physical and spiritual union: Cornish ‘felt [Elizabeth] shaken by old daemonic mysteries ... Unleashed and naked in the pitiless wind, his spirit sought hers. *There was no division between them ...*’ (italics added, 209). Unlike in the love-making scenes in Jameson’s *The Happy Highways*, this time no doubts are cast on the authenticity of the meeting between Self and Other: it *is* possible to bridge the gap of difference. In keeping with Lawrence’s new concern with impermanence, however, the emphasis is now on the ephemerality of all such meetings. Just as in the latter text ‘out of the swoon, the waves ebb back’ (RDP 264), so for Cornish and Elizabeth the clashing waves become ‘cloven’ and all too soon ‘the spirit returned to [Elizabeth’s] numbed body and remembrance slipped between them like a sword’ (*Clash* 209). The morning after this moment of consummation Elizabeth realizes the pain that she has exposed herself to by opening up to the Other, since happiness cannot be a permanent state and each being must be self-responsible. Like many a Lawrentian lover, she breaks down and begs Cornish, ‘Do not leave me’,³⁵ but when Cornish assures her that she is his life, she knows this to be untrue, replying: ‘Your life is more than that. I am alone. I am alone’ (210).

According to a pro-Lawrentian reading of ‘Harvest’, Elizabeth’s eventual refusal to accompany Cornish to America and her return to Jamie – and, by implication, Jameson’s refusal to accompany ‘J’ to America and her loyalty to Clarke – represents a failure of spiritual courage in the face of self-responsibility and the flux of life. In refusing the risk of fully opening up to the Other and preferring to cling to the fantasy of permanence offered by the idealist morality of her English husband, Elizabeth’s behaviour thus recalls that of Lawrence’s English cabbages clinging on to their outer leaves. Taking refuge in a return to

35 For example, Helena Verden, Will Brangwen, Cicio and March, all of whom either ask their partner not to leave them or realise they themselves are incapable of leaving their partner. See *Trespasser*, 100, R, 173, LG, 331, and *Three*, 153, respectively.

fantasy, Elizabeth has imagined a 'very wise and patient' Jamie granting her permission to 'do as you like, but come back to me when life has hurt you' (190). Yet although Jamie's liberal ideals oblige him to show the errant Elizabeth tolerance and compassion, in the event things do not turn out quite as she has imagined. Since 'Life is a hunger that will be fed' (281), Jamie's compassion – like Cornish's love – turns out to be a Nietzschean exercise in power:

A curious gleam came into his eyes, a flash of something like hatred that was gone in an instant. Into his gaze a quality of fierceness entered, new and disturbing ... [Elizabeth] went with him, shrinking a little. (310)

On the anti-Lawrentian side of *The Clash's* intertextual dialogue, Jameson emphasises the unequal degree of risk involved in opening up to the sexual Other in a contemporary culture in which the woman is *already* construed as society's Other. Jameson's feminist perspective here clearly derives from the psychological and even physical suffering she had herself experienced as a consequence of her early belief in free love with its Marsdenian dismissal of gender difference, an experience she had touched on in the story of Margaret's divorce in *The Happy Highways*. In *The Clash*, Jameson foregrounds this issue intertextually by revisioning *The Lost Girl* to suggest that in it Lawrence misrepresents the probable consequences – both material and psychological – of Alvina's rebellion against accepted sexual mores. Jameson first alludes to the latter novel in the cameo of 'the lost girl', Bertha (*Clash* 65). Less fortunate than Lawrence's Alvina, Bertha is abandoned by her lover when he discovers she is pregnant, and rejected by her family when she turns to them for help. Allusions to *The Lost Girl* continue when Elizabeth's regret at her lack of solidarity with Bertha impels her to set up a maternity hospital for other lost girls. (Lawrence's Alvina was, of course, a qualified maternity nurse.) Furthermore, a visit to the slums of Bethnal Green (a breeding ground for prostitution) reveals to Elizabeth the likely end for most lost girls, and it is sarcastically observed that 'the crown' of civilisation is just such sexual exploitation – not, it is implied, the creative union between Self and Other that Lawrence envisages (*Clash* 240).

In addition to the 'lost girls' who form part of the social context of the novel, Elizabeth's great-aunt Miriam – who has already passed the test of sexual freedom – offers a more complex example, nearer home, of the 'lost girl' phenomenon and the risks Elizabeth runs in her affair with Cornish. As a young woman, like Lawrence's Alvina, Miriam ran away to Europe with her lover, and her memories of a foreign peasant culture within a savage mountain landscape recall a combination of the hostile Italian mountains and the fantasy-savages, the Natcha-Kee-Tawara, of *The Lost Girl*:

The sun scorched the hard earth and played on knives and glittering bridles. *Ai*, the proud horses! She touched the gleaming necks. In the evening the women danced on the burnt grass, while the mountains turned black against the sky, jagged like the teeth of a saw. (*Clash* 44)

Lawrence's novel ends with Alvina living alone in an alien land after her husband has departed for the Great War, but holding on to his promise to return (and to the convenient fail safe of the money she has salvaged from the liquidation of her father's estate). Miriam's fate in *The Clash* suggests a grim but credible sequel. Alone in a similarly alien land after her young lover has been shot during an earlier war, the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1, she is tossed about at the mercy of both male brutality and political contingency: 'After that she was starved in a potato famine in Russia, seduced by a Bulgarian during a little war and married to a Levantine who beat her' (18).

In her characterisation of Miriam, Jameson also writes back to the fear of women's sexuality that characterises Lawrence's recent work as exemplified by his *English Review* essay, 'Nathaniel Hawthorne' (May 1919). Miriam is first introduced to the reader in her old age when she has returned home to live out the remainder of her days as an outcast from conventional society, taking refuge with her brother, the disillusioned idealist, Gilbert Manners, and helping to raise her orphaned niece, Elizabeth. At this point in her life, Miriam is specifically associated with the 'lost' scarlet woman, Hester Prynne, in Lawrence's reading of Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850): 'The woman who opened [the door] held a lamp above her head. The light flung grotesque shadows on the stiff crimson

folds of her gown' (*Clash* 20). Like Lawrence's and Hawthorne's Hester, Jameson's Miriam contains a 'rich voluptuous ... characteristic – a taste for the gorgeously beautiful' (Hawthorne, qtd. in *SCAL* 250). This characteristic is revealed in her sensitivity to music and in the 'gargantuan' feasts she prepares whenever occasion permits (120). Like Lawrence's Hester, too, she is described as a 'witch' and a 'gypsy', and is believed to possess a 'malevolent power' (*SCAL* 249–51; *Clash* 18, 129, 207–8, 237, 281).

Jameson's explanation of the formation of Miriam's character in *The Clash* could not, however, be more different from Lawrence's explanation of the formation of Hester's in his Hawthorne essay. Lawrence sees Hester's 'malevolent power' as deriving from her disruption of the natural order. By taking the initiative in seducing Arthur Dimmesdale, she has broken a 'law' that says that 'woman cannot take the creative lead' and has thus become 'mystically destructive' (*SCAL* 247–8). Jameson's scarlet woman, Miriam, on the other hand, is a highly conscious and articulate voice of wisdom and experience in the novel, and if she also has a malevolent power, that power is attributed to the psychological effects of man-made social conditions. Miriam, we are told, 'was nursing a savage resentment against life, which had led her such a dance' and when one considers the suffering she has been through, it is not at all surprising that she has become a little twisted (*Clash* 122).³⁶ Miriam thus serves as an alter ego for Elizabeth/Jameson, reflecting her own sensual inner nature but also offering a chill warning of what she is likely to become should she rebel against social convention and become a 'freewoman'. She is a 'terrible familiar' presenting Elizabeth with 'her own face, grown old and cruel' (281). Looking into her eyes, Elizabeth can 'read her own heart' (281).

Finally, Jameson's anti-Lawrentian line of argument in *The Clash* also draws attention to the political dangers of Lawrence's recent glamorisation of 'primitive' 'natural' environments in which 'might' equals 'right' in his *Studies* and *The Lost Girl*. Simpson and

36 Jameson would create a similarly witch-like character – going by the symbolic name of 'Mercy Hardman' – in *The Voyage Home*.

Rowbotham have argued that in his later ‘primitive’ novels Lawrence was drawing on a ‘Mean Man’ cult that flourished in the 1920s in the sensational romances of Ethel M. Dell (1881–1939) and others, offering women ‘submission ... masquerading as erotic liberation’ (Rowbotham, qtd. in Simpson 122).³⁷ These novels were set in ‘the great outdoors ... where physical strength is still of some importance’, and were based on the premise that at a ‘natural’ level women must recognize their biological inferiority to men and happily embrace their ‘essentially masochistic’ sexual role (Simpson 123, 125). Rowbotham observes that contemporary ‘feminists had no political weapons with which to counter’ this cult, but Jameson had a literary one (qtd. in Simpson 122). Through multiple intertextual references to the ‘Mean Men’ in Lawrence’s most recent ‘primitive’ texts, Jameson draws attention to the constructed nature of the essentialist philosophy underlying them and hence to the fact that women’s sexual subordination is *not* inevitable. Her strategy is two-pronged. On the one hand, she too places her lovers in ‘the great outdoors’ – on the Downs at night, in the woods or beside a stormy northern sea – echoing Lawrence’s romanticized representations of the Mean Man’s biological superiority in the context of nature. On the other, she also draws back from this Lawrentian model, moving her lovers into specifically historicized political and cultural contexts: visiting the slums of Bethnal Green; having dinner at the home of the newspaper magnate, Lord Weaverbridge (Beaverbrook); watching soldiers returning from the war. These contexts require a different, more analytical linguistic register and serve as a reminder to both heroine and reader that the choice is not between nature and culture but between two constructed cultural and political systems.

In her representation of the relationship between Cornish and Elizabeth within the context of nature, Jameson makes specific allusion to Lawrence’s primitivist view in his essay on Crèvecoeur that ‘lordship and empire’ are part of ‘the sensual mystery’ in which ‘there is ... the impulse of the lesser sensual psyche to yield itself ... to the greater psyche’

37 *The Clash* may be seen, among other things, as a therapeutic literary riposte aimed at the publisher, Fisher Unwin, who recommended Dell to Jameson as a literary model in her youth. See Introduction, p.9, n.12.

(*SCAL* 196). In Elizabeth the ‘Mean Man’ Cornish chooses a fitting sexual adversary who will yet preserve the asymmetry of the natural order, for if she has ‘strength’ she also has ‘slenderness’ so that ‘her endurance was almost [but not quite] equal to his own’ (179). Just as the ‘vibrating’ wild quails peck grain from Crèvecoeur’s masterful hand (which could crush them on a whim) in Lawrence’s essay (*SCAL* 199), so in *The Clash* Cornish foresees how Elizabeth ‘in his arms ... would thrill, her soft young body shrinking from his touch like the body of a frightened bird’ (*Clash* 179).³⁸ Furthermore, Cornish is not alone in desiring Elizabeth’s sexual subordination. With characteristic honesty, Jameson unwaveringly depicts the temptation to sexual masochism in her heroine – and, by implication, in herself:

He released his hold so that she lay in the curve of one arm. With his free hand he pushed her gown violently off her shoulders, tearing the flimsy stuff. Hard cruel kisses bruised her. She swayed against him in a blind response. (*Clash* 308)

Just as Lawrence makes it plain in his Crèvecoeur essay that (in the wild) the stronger being will, if necessary, ‘enforce’ its will against the weaker (*SCAL* 197), so – alluding also to a number of Lawrence’s recent ‘Mean Men’ – Jameson makes it clear in *The Clash* that Cornish is capable of ‘enforcing’ *his* will against Elizabeth, should she fail to comply with his desires. Firstly, there is the symbolic scene in which Cornish brutally subdues his horse when it shies at the sound of a noisy aeroplane during a ride in the woods (*Clash* 231), a scene that recalls Gerald’s domination of *his* horse at the railway crossing in the ‘Coal Dust’ chapter of *Women in Love*. Then there are echoes of Cicio’s rape of Alvina in an early scene in which Elizabeth’s refusal of Cornish’s advances leads him to fantasize about raping her: ‘Back in his hut he took a revenge. Her body lay before him and he regarded its white limbs without emotion ...’ (*Clash* 185). Finally, there are multiple allusions to Gerald’s aborted strangulation of Gudrun at the end of *Women in Love*. Lawrence’s language in this episode conveys a sense of the biological appropriateness of Gerald’s attempt, the notion

38 Lawrence uses the same image when describing Gerald’s sexual power over the Professor’s daughter in *WIL* (463).

of failure at the end of the novel connecting not to strangulation itself but to Gerald's inability to give himself wholeheartedly to what is seen as a natural experience. Indeed, as the strangulation reaches its (interrupted) climax in *Women in Love*, there are distinct parallels with the 'frantic struggles for the enforcing of ... culmination' that Lawrence sees as part of the Law of Nature in his essay on Crèvecoeur (*SCAL* 197):

[Gerald] took the throat of Gudrun between his hands, that were hard and indomitably powerful. And her throat was beautifully, so beautifully soft, save that, within, he could feel the slippery chords of her life. And this he crushed, this he *could* crush ... oh how good it was, what a God-given gratification ... The struggling was her reciprocal lustful passion in this embrace, the more violent it became, the greater the frenzy of delight, till the zenith was reached. (*WIL* 531)

In her various allusions to the episode above, Jameson repeatedly foregrounds the use of natural imagery and, specifically, the combination of tenderness and brutality with which Lawrence legitimizes such sinister sexual dominance. Thus, as in the passage above, violence on the part of the male and vulnerability on the part of the woman are made to seem natural and inevitable given the innate hardness of the man's hands and the innate softness and fragility of the woman's neck:

His hands lay open on his knees. She saw the square short fingers curl inwards. (*Clash* 264)

Her face ... bent like a flower on its stem. (*Clash* 178)

He bent her head back on her throat and thought along how narrow a channel her life flowed. (*Clash* 206)

On the other hand, Jameson deglamorizes and historicizes such naturalized representations of violence by means of the political world that impinges upon the otherwise timeless world of the lovers, and of the arguments that this alternative world provokes between them. In two such episodes in particular, the motif of the lynch mob serves as a crucial reminder that Cornish's private sexual sadism is part of a more public political philosophy and that America is not a primitive pre-lapsarian world or even part of a Lawrentian mythological scheme, but, rather, a contemporary political system based on historically constructed patterns of power. In one episode, to get back at Elizabeth

following a row over the emasculated nature of British nationalism, Cornish tells her the story of a lynching so that Elizabeth ‘saw the broken mutilated body of the I.W.W. man and heard the cry that broke through that frightful mouth – “For Christ’s sake, shoot me: don’t let me suffer like this”’ (*Clash* 271). The story is a specific historical allusion to the worst of the many reprisals against members of International Workers of the World from 1915 into the 1920s in which a capitalist U. S. Government colluded, that is, the lynching of Wesley Everest. In November 1919, Everest was turned over to the lynch mob by prison guards, had his teeth smashed with a rifle butt, was castrated, lynched three times in three separate locations and had his corpse riddled with bullets.³⁹ The harsh, documentary language which Jameson uses to describe this terrible incident notably cuts across the romanticized Lawrentian language which she uses to suggest the naturalness of violence in the scenes set in ‘the great outdoors’.⁴⁰

In another episode, a socialist pamphlet found on a table in Elizabeth’s house produces a diatribe from Cornish against socialism in general and the writer of the pamphlet in particular. Provoked, Elizabeth replies: ‘I expect you would lynch him’, to which Cornish, in turn, replies that if Elizabeth were a man, he would ‘thrash’ her. Elizabeth concludes the exchange with the enigmatic observation: ‘Oh, you don’t mean a man: you mean an American’ (*Clash* 184). An earlier comment by one of Elizabeth’s English male friends, Andrew de la Mothe, provides an important gloss on this observation. When Elizabeth observed that she could ‘never get the whip hand’ of Cornish, Andrew explained:

‘That’s because he doesn’t believe in you ... Englishmen have been better trained. We *know* that women are better and wiser and – oh, much cleverer – than men. But your charming barbarian hasn’t been told it yet, and wouldn’t believe it if you did tell him.’ (*Clash* 137)

What keeps Cornish from ‘thrashing’ Elizabeth, therefore – or even raping or strangling her – is the couple’s location in a liberal idealist English culture that still gives at least

39 For an account of this incident, see Cashman, 539–40.

40 This strategy recalls Jameson’s earlier use of Kersent’s harsh documentary language to cut across Chamberlain’s liberal idealist abstractions in *The Happy Highways*.

partial credence to the Victorian notion of women as the guardians of moral values. Back in a more materialist America where might is the sole arbiter of right, the text implies, the female Elizabeth would have no more protection than the lynched I.W.W. man – ‘You will take no lover when I am your husband’, Cornish warns (*Clash* 202). Given the choice between an anarchistic American social system in which women and working-class men are offered next to no legal or moral protection and the *relative* security and equality offered by a decaying English liberalism, an anti-Lawrentian reading of ‘Harvest’ would suggest that Elizabeth/Jameson’s final decision in favour of the latter is not unreasonable and that the English tradition of liberal idealism may not be so dreadful after all.

Jameson Reading Lawrence Reading the Brontë Sisters and Ruskin in *The Pitiful Wife*

Ever self-critical, in *Journey* Jameson condemns *The Pitiful Wife*, her first commercial success, as ‘that neo-gothic abortion’ (JN1 247). What weakens the novel, however, is not the presence of the gothic, but rather the absence of any real dialogic tension. Instead of testing intertexts against personal experience and vice versa in accordance with her previous practice, in *The Pitiful Wife* Jameson tests only her own experience against intertexts that she accepts unquestioningly. These intertexts are Lawrence’s literary interpretation and adaptation of two kinds of gothic – the Brontëan and the Ruskinian – in response to what he saw as a dominant liberal idealism within English society. As mentioned earlier, the personal experience upon which Jameson draws in *The Pitiful Wife* is that of sexual betrayal, and she seems to have found Lawrence’s gothic vision particularly helpful as a means of interpreting and thus distancing this particularly painful experience. The fact that around the same time Jameson was also writing *Lady Susan: An Indiscretion* – a light-hearted skit against upper-class modernist aestheticism that clearly has Bloomsbury in its sights – suggests that her aesthetic identification with Lawrence in *The Pitiful Wife* was also part of an implied dialogue with Bloomsbury’s high modernism, a dialogue that would become the central focus of her next novel, *Three Kingdoms*. Reflecting the uncritical nature

of Jameson's reading of Lawrence in *The Pitiful Wife*, the novel's key intertexts are those of his works that she most admired, namely 'The *Signature Crown*' and *The Rainbow*.

Before embarking on an examination of *The Pitiful Wife* itself, a clue to Jameson's aesthetic (and ideological) thinking at this stage can be gleaned from an apparently irrelevant (or, in Riffaterrean terms, 'ungrammatical') scene towards the end of *The Clash*, in which Miriam decides somewhat whimsically to give her grown-up niece a bath. Contemplating Elizabeth in her nakedness, Miriam wonders whether the female body is not 'the chiefest human symbol' because it is 'forever Unfinished, the eternal Imperfect. It is therefore human life' (193). Jameson appears to be thinking here of *The Rainbow* in which Lawrence associates the female body with an 'imperfect' Ruskinian gothic architecture, although, if this is the case, then she is also writing back to Lawrence's essentialist association of that same female body with procreation. Thus Miriam argues that although 'the earth is figured as a woman for her fruitfulness', 'it is woman's provocative unsatisfying curves that are a true symbol of life, and not her fruitfulness, which is capricious' (*Clash* 193). Nevertheless, in contrast to a *New Age* 'classical' misogyny which argued that 'no female form is beautiful' (Eyre 439), Lawrence's celebration of the imperfection of the female body in *The Rainbow* must have seemed particularly appealing to Jameson. It also extended the exploration of the value of imperfection which she had found so compelling in his story, 'The Second Best'.

In *D. H. Lawrence and Modernism*, Pinkney argues that in re-imagining the gothic cathedral as a female body in *The Rainbow*, Lawrence brings together 'the Gothic as a mode of utopian architecture leading towards socialism in Ruskin and Morris, and the Gothic as a subversive female literary form', creating 'an unprecedented textual fusion of two of the most powerful strands of British oppositional social and literary thought' (67, 78).⁴¹ (Pinkney also notes the symbolic relevance here of the copy of *Wuthering Heights* that

41 A number of other critics have also commented on the importance of Ruskin's influence on Lawrence. See Fernihough, *Aesthetics*, 134–7; Chaudhuri, 196–213; Michelucci, 181–93; Wallace, 205; and Worthen, *Early Years* 122.

Skrebensky gives to Ursula.) While Sharon Ouditt has noted echoes of Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* in *The Pitiful Wife*, it has so far gone unobserved amongst Jameson critics that her novel also draws on two opposing responses to Ruskin within Lawrence's work, that is, on his admiring allusions to Ruskin's 'Nature of the Gothic' (1853) in *The Rainbow* and on his extensive critique of Ruskin's misogynistic idealism - and of the Pre-Raphaelite art with which it is associated - in his early work in general.⁴² On the other hand, Jameson, who was coming from the same romantic-modernist tradition as Lawrence, would certainly have been alert to the allusions to Ruskin in *his* work.

In *The Pitiful Wife*, each of the types of gothic that Pinkney detects in *The Rainbow* is explored through a different character, the gothic as 'a subversive female literary form' through the novel's heroine, Jael Drew, née Trude; the Ruskinian architectural gothic, through her sculptor-husband, Richmond. This discussion begins with Jameson's exploration of Brontëan gothic through Jael's story. In a sense, that story can be described as 'Ruskinian ideal heroine meets Brontëan Other-within-the-Self', with Lawrence providing the intertextual link between the two. When her husband first meets her, the young Jael *is* the queenly woman described by Ruskin in his second lecture in *Sesame and Lilies*, 'Lilies. Of Queen's Gardens'. Echoing all the elements of Ruskin's title, she is associated with 'lilies' (84), with Aubrey Beardsley's Pre-Raphaelite-style illustrations of Queen Guenever, and with a walled garden that protects one side of the house from the wildness of the moors.⁴³ She also embodies the precise blend of natural health, flawless beauty and innocent piety that Ruskin recommends in a woman, and her very moderate level of educational attainment is just enough to allow her to perform the role of 'helpmate' - or in this case of *garçon d'atelier* - to her future husband, as he requires (*Sesame* 91). Above all, Jael is equipped to fulfil what Ruskin sees as woman's 'great function ... Praise' (*Sesame*

42 For a discussion of the latter and, in particular, of the ignominious fate of Ruskin's *Sesame and Lilies* in Lawrence's story 'The Goose Fair', see Michelucci, 181-3. For the influence of Ruskin's 'Nature of the Gothic' on the ideology of the Leeds Arts Club and, hence, on the early *New Age*, see Steele, 263.

43 The epigraph to Book II - 'How Queen Guenever rode on Maying' - is the title of one of Beardsley's illustrations for Dent's 1894 edition of Malory's *The Birth, Life and Acts of King Arthur*. In *The Rainbow*, too, the young Ursula imagines herself as a Pre-Raphaelite Guinevere.

107). Thus, for example, she writes with unquestioning admiration to her young lover: 'It is wonderful that you are to be a great sculptor' (*PW* 85).⁴⁴

However, there is also an alternative intertextual realm within the novel represented by Jael's Heathcliff-like father, John Trude, who lives disgraced and shut out of sight in the central hall and right wing of the Trudes' ancestral home, Trudesthorne, (recalling also the 'madwoman in the attic', Bertha Mason, from Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*), while Jael and her brother inhabit its left wing together with the devout servant who has raised them. Carol Siegel has observed that as in the case of Heathcliff's relation to Cathy in *Wuthering Heights*, the Heathcliff-like characters in certain Lawrence novels – including Annable in *The White Peacock*, Cicio in *The Lost Girl* and Henry in *The Fox* – can all be read as 'symbolic representations' of 'a displaced aspect of the heroine' (56–7).⁴⁵ Similarly, John Trude can be interpreted as a 'displaced aspect' of Jael, an aspect with which she will be brought face to face during the course of the novel via the catalyst of the Great War and the sexual infidelity of her husband, Richmond.

A key to the Lawrentian link between Ruskinian and Brontëan intertexts within this symbolic story of Jael's journey into the dark side of the Self is to be found in a scene which alludes to Lawrence's 'Signature Crown' and which occurs relatively late on in *The Pitiful Wife*. By this stage in the narrative, Richmond has fought in the Great War (thus fulfilling his Ruskinian role as masculine 'defender' of home and country (*Sesame* 107)), has returned home and is now in disgrace with his wife for a sexual affair in which he has

44 There are a number of other echoes of *Sesame* in *PW*. Ruskin compares the marital home to a 'temple' into which 'hostile society' should not be allowed to penetrate; Jael later reproaches Richmond for 'admitt[ing] a stranger to the inner shrine' of their love (*Sesame* 108; *PW* 286). Ruskin also describes the marital home as a garden with protecting walls which make it the wife's 'place of Peace'; Jael later reproaches Richmond: 'I had a secure peace in my heart and lived with you in ... a garden enclosed' (*Sesame* 138; *PW* 292). Finally, Ruskin argues that a woman's education should take her only 'as far as the threshold of that bitter Valley of Humiliation, into which only the wisest and bravest of *men* descend'; in *PW*, on the other hand, Jael has eventually to 'go down into the Valley of Humiliation, because that *all* travellers must' (italics added, *Sesame* 114; *PW* 245).

45 Given the fact that Jameson read *Aaron's Rod* almost as soon as it was published, it is just possible that she may have read the hauntingly gothic novella 'The Fox', which was published in *The Dial* in May to August 1922, before or whilst writing *PW*.

sought oblivion from the trauma of war. In the scene in question, Richmond is watching by the bedside of his sick son when he finds himself gazing ‘half asleep and half idly ... at the absurdly smiling lion and wreathed unicorn he had painted on [the bed’s] narrow foot’ (321). This symbolic painting offers a reading of Richmond and Jael’s relationship at this point in the novel in Lawrentian terms. The ‘absurdly smiling lion’ is the physical ‘young lion’, Richmond, uncomfortable in his discovered guilt (107). More significantly, the ‘wreathed [or crowned] unicorn’ is Jael who has attributed value solely to her own idealist perspective, just as ‘the unicorn of virtue’ in Lawrence’s *Signature Crown* is described as having taken sole possession of the crown that should remain above the heads of both lion and unicorn and ‘has gone mad with the extremity of light’ (RDP 259). Up to this point Jael has embodied Ruskin’s requirement for the absolute ‘movelessness’ of the ideal (*Sesame* 89). She has not changed her stance as the loyal and adoring wife and therefore, in her virtuousness, she reproaches Richmond with the words, ‘We were to live together and be kind to each other *always* – and loyal and honest – *always*’ (PW 279). For Lawrence in ‘The *Signature Crown*’, however, it is precisely when ‘that which is temporal and relative asserts itself eternal and absolute’ that evil occurs (RDP 272). Agreeing with this point of view, Richmond compares the destructive effect of Jael’s rigidly self-righteous behaviour to that of her Old Testament name-sake who, in *her* self-righteousness, drove a tent peg through the head of Sisera to deliver Israel from the troops of King Jabin (PW 307) – a biblical allusion that Lawrence himself would surely have enjoyed. Richmond also argues that ‘it wasn’t possible ... a marriage like that. Did you expect me to remain always the same and never change or grow? ... This is life ... Not a dream or a romance. Life is always changing. Nothing ever turns out just as you thought it would. You can’t live and not change’ (PW 280).

In order to move on and to discover the dark Other that lies *within* the Self, in this somewhat allegorical novel Jael must finally go through the locked door that separates the two sides of Trudesthorpe and recognise her consanguinity with her Heathcliffe-like father.

The story that leads up to this climactic moment of recognition contains elements of the uncanny which are also distinctly Lawrentian. As her relationship with Richmond deteriorates and she struggles to repress an ‘uncanny fury’, she becomes ‘like a wild thing caged’ and a mysterious black cat begins to haunt the story, as if the Trude spirit had been let out of the bag (*PW* 277, 283). This incarnation of Jael’s dark power most resembles ‘the wild-cat invisible in the night’ which Count Dionys tells Lady Daphne is ‘the real you’ in Lawrence’s ‘The Ladybird’ (*Three* 36), although, since the novella was only published in March 1923 and *The Pitiful Wife* was published in August of the same year, it seems unlikely that there is a direct influence here. Nevertheless, the concept of a mysterious animal power as an aspect of the human could also be derived from a number of Lawrence’s earlier texts, including Ursula’s encounter with the horses at the end of *The Rainbow*, Gudrun’s struggle with the caged rabbit in *Women in Love*, or the fox in Lawrence’s eponymous novella. Despite Jael’s willed control over her feelings, as her young son, David, sagely observes, ‘A black cat ... can get ... even through a tight shut door’, and so it emerges from her psyche, appearing first to David and then taking over her lame brother, Jude (*PW* 222). Rebelling against his father for the first time, Jude becomes not only ‘catlike’ but – recalling Lawrence’s somewhat gothic poem, ‘The Snake’ – ‘smile[s] and stare[s] blankly and sway[s] just so like a snake’ (*PW* 227).⁴⁶

Jameson’s black cat also symbolises a Lawrentian psychological power to kill, and the manner in which this power works itself out in the story recalls Lawrence’s use of the gothic ‘as what is horrible-good, necessary and vital to be striven for’ (Hurma 236). In a fit of burning hatred for Richmond that for an instant includes David also as ‘the sign and symbol of the shame’ of her sexual betrayal, Jael unconsciously exerts her power to kill, causing her young son to lose his hold on life at the very same moment when she has finally visited her father and recognised her kinship with him (*PW* 312). As the story reaches a climax, Jael is involved in a furious struggle to bring the moribund David back to

46 ‘The Snake’ was first published in the *Dial* in July 1921 and in the *London Mercury* in October of the same year.

life, a struggle that includes her commitment, if necessary, to cross over the border of death in order to fetch him back. When – against all medical expectations – David revives, he tells the doctor that ‘a black cat came an’ threw me over the edge of the cliff’ (*PW* 327). David’s near-death experience is a necessary prelude to the revival of his parents’ marriage and the realisation that ‘men do not live for beauty unattainable ... but because they have some time desired to live ... In pain and blood the flame flickers unquenched’ (*PW* 322).

If Jael must leave behind her pre-war moral idealism in *The Pitiful Wife*, her sculptor-husband, Richmond, must leave behind his pre-war aesthetic idealism, and again John Trude has an important role within this process, this time as a symbol not of Lawrence’s Brontëan but of his Ruskinian gothic. Discussing the influence of Ruskin’s ‘The Nature of the Gothic’ on Lawrence’s poetics, Amit Chaudhuri reads Ruskin’s interpretation of architectural gothic as a ‘cultural-political trope’ that faces two ways (198). Firstly, it signifies resistance ‘to the inheritance of the Roman Empire; to the “high” European sources of the Renaissance’ and, in particular, to ‘that aspect of Western culture that strives towards transcendence and “perfection”’ (and here one thinks of Lawrence’s relationship to Bloomsbury and ‘high’ modernism) (199). Secondly, in its ‘rudeness’ and ‘savageness’, it signifies ‘English identity’s “difference” from itself’. Chaudhuri adds that Ruskin stands as Lawrence’s ‘precursor’ in being ‘probably the first English commentator to introduce the theme of “difference” into the discussion of culture’ (199).

Not only does the great hall where Trude spends both his days and nights recall the gothic cathedrals that inhabit both Ruskin’s essay and Lawrence’s *The Rainbow*, but also, illustrating Chaudhuri’s thesis, the tale of how he got there is one of a specifically northern dissent, recalling Ruskin’s comparison of the gothic imagination to the ‘wild and wayward’ North Sea (*Stones* II: 155).⁴⁷ Watching ship-wrecked sailors take three days and nights to die in a storm that is so violent that it is impossible to launch the life-boats, as a young man

47 This motif runs through the novel, for example in the following description of the darker side of Jael: ‘With ... grey eyes dark like the northern seas in storm she sat and brooded’ (*PW* 311).

Trude loses his religious faith and is thenceforth identified with the doubters who, in *Jude* 1:13, are compared to ‘raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame’ (*PW* 165). Jameson’s description of the vast gothic hall to which Trude eventually retreats to nurse his rebellious anger contains multiple echoes of Ruskin’s essay. Originally created ‘to the glory of God’, its roof is ‘arched like the nave of a cathedral, and the oaken beams rest[] fanwise on fluted oaken pillars’ (*PW* 11). Between the pillars is a frieze carved by one of Richmond’s ancestors and together pillars and frieze embody all six of the elements that Ruskin enumerates as characteristic of the Gothic. ‘Rigidity’ is present in the pillars that stand ‘like trees that a cunning hand had moulded in the likeness of stone’; ‘Redundance’ in the profuse foliage on which the craftsman worked obsessively for many years of his life; ‘Naturalism’ in the ‘wild beasts’ wrought ‘as if they lived’ and so on (Ruskin, *Stones* II: 152; *PW* 11–12). Most importantly, ‘Grotesqueness’ is present in the ‘imps’ that also allude to the imps that the doubting Anna clings to in the Winchester Cathedral episode of *The Rainbow* and which are thus an intertextual symbol of Trude’s own dissent (Ruskin, *Stones* II: 152; *PW* 12).

The contrast between the above gothic aesthetic and Richmond’s idealist aesthetic as a young man before the war is also mapped intertextually. At the age of fourteen, Richmond is sent to study classical and Renaissance sculpture under his grandfather in Europe, where he is taken to Florence, introduced to ‘the transcendent ... catholicity of Leonardo, the perfect artist’ and initiated into ‘the sharp piercing Hellenic dream of beauty’ (*PW* 70). When he returns home, Richmond is attracted to Jael as an embodiment of this dream of aesthetic perfection, writing in a love letter to her that she ‘sing[s] beauty ... like Giotto’s tower in Florence sings’ (*PW* 84). With characteristically Jamesonian complexity, Richmond’s epistolary phrase is a double intertextual reference, evoking Lawrence’s aesthetic differences with Ruskin-the-Idealist, for – as Michelucci has noted – ‘Ruskin’s and Lawrence’s contrasting attitudes towards the Christian heritage are reflected ... in their way of “reading” Florence and its works of art’ (188). In particular, whereas Ruskin sees

Giotto's Campanile as epitomising 'the purity and the spiritual ardour' of a Christian heritage, Lawrence – as Aaron in *Aaron's Rod* – is struck by the tower's 'proud, pagan virility' (Michelucci 188). At this stage in the narrative, the young Richmond, needless to say, shares Ruskin's idealist way of reading Florence.

Richmond's aesthetic journey towards an appreciation of a more Lawrentian 'earthly' and earthy beauty is by way of the Great War where he witnesses the death in pain and mud of his closest friend. Returning home traumatized, unable to sculpt and mired in an emotionally anaethetising sexual intrigue, Richmond's journey must go through two further stages. Firstly, he begins sculpting again after witnessing a scene that recalls both the opening scene of *Wuthering Heights* – in which Lockwood encounters Heathcliff's half-wild dogs – and the sensuous scene from Lawrence's *White Peacock* in which a half-naked George romps on the ground with his dog. Entering Trude's side of the house one evening, Richmond discovers him romping on the ground stark naked with the half-wild dogs with which he shares his hall. However, the new aesthetic vision that Trude inspires in Richmond at this stage is a wholly materialist one and one which is motivated by 'a cold passion of hate' at 'the thought of his and all men's kinship with Trude' (*PW* 171):

In every sketch he made, Trude was crouching with lower limbs half-rooted in the earth, or reared with muscles drawn back for a leap. He was not animal: he was sub-human, the lowest blindest force of life. (*PW* 171)

The final stage of Richmond's aesthetic journey takes him via his epiphanic vision of the lion and unicorn painted on the foot of his son's bed to an understanding of the hybrid and imperfect nature of human life. The sculpture of Trude that he envisages as a result of this new understanding both epitomises the humanly mixed and creatively unfinished nature of Ruskin's gothic and recalls Ursula's vision of a 'gothic' rainbow at the end of Lawrence's eponymous novel, a rainbow which is arched in the 'disintegration' of the miners' blood but presages a time when 'new, clean, naked bodies would issue to a new germination' (*R* 459):

The great figure he had made of John Trude ... changed under [Richmond's] eyes. His knees were on the ground, but his body was flung back, with great muscles straining and throat swelling in the rage of his effort. At the bottom of the sunken eyepits light stirred, and in one vast upflung arm he held a small laughing boy. Richmond glanced sideways at his sleeping son. (*PW* 321)

Conclusion

This chapter has shown how Jameson was drawn to Lawrence's work for what she saw as its honesty regarding the human capacity for violence, for its insistence on dialogue between Self and Other despite the difficulties involved, and for a gothic aesthetic that reflected her own sense of the hybrid, impure nature of reality. It has offered an intertextual reading of *The Clash*, in which Jameson's feminist appraisal of Lawrence's primitivist representations of male-female relations results in a balancing of the ethical benefits of authentic relationship with the Other against the risks of masculine power unfettered by the constraints of an idealist Western society. This chapter has gone on to read *The Pitiful Wife* as a semi-autobiographical version of Jameson's own experience of sexual betrayal interpreted through the lens of Lawrentian gothic, in both its Brontëan and its Ruskinian manifestations. In contrast to *The Clash*, *The Pitiful Wife* has been shown to share both Lawrence's and Emily Brontë's depiction of violence within the female as much as in the male Self and their view that Western idealist social norms that paint women as innocently pure produce psychological distortion and hamper self-understanding. Jameson's exploration of Lawrence's reading of Ruskinian gothic in *The Pitiful Wife* has been shown to validate its eschewal of purist extremes and its evocation of the hybridity and imperfection of post-war modernity. This modern hybridity and imperfection would be reflected in the very title of Jameson's next novel, *Three Kingdoms*, which would develop further the notion of an imperfect, protean and material (female) Self within the very different context of the post-war metropolitan cultural centre.

Chapter 6

‘The Battle of the Brows’: Writing back to Virginia Woolf’s ‘Character in Fiction’ (1924) and *Mrs Dalloway* (1925) in *Three Kingdoms* (1926)

Nature had been trying out something new in Laurence and had flung the creature out with all its imperfections on its head. (3K: 114)

Prelude

The following is an account of some of the features to be found in an unnamed novel first published in the 1920s: The main character is a beautiful and charming (although highly conventional) society hostess. She is a middle-aged woman who has been diagnosed with a ‘tired heart’ and ordered to take regular rest (73). She possesses ‘a vivid green dress with a long fish-tail’, the skirt of which has been trodden on at a party (41). Her lack of interest in politics is summed up by her confusion of the Armenians with the Turks at the height of the Armenian massacres. Her only daughter is entirely unlike her. In contrast to her mother, she possesses an earnest social conscience, and, although she is just emerging into adulthood, she takes no interest in clothes or parties, but ‘wander[s] about London in the most unbecoming mackintosh’ (10).¹

The reader could be forgiven for assuming that the above account refers to Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* which was published in 1925 and in which all the aforementioned features occur – although the character who wears an unbecoming mackintosh is not Mrs. Dalloway’s daughter, Elizabeth, but her tutor, Miss Kilman. In fact, the account is a description of Jameson’s *Lady Susan: An Indiscretion*, which was published two years before Woolf’s novel, raising the question as to whether Woolf was writing back to Jameson’s crude, if at times extremely amusing, satire of her circle in her far more psychologically subtle novel. Jameson’s satirical squib is aimed at bohemian upper-class aesthetes who

1 The name of the relevant novel has been deliberately removed from the page references included in this description for rhetorical effect.

regard the Arts as their birthright and who, although they may play at being avant-garde, fail to make any genuine connection between culture and the ‘real’ – economic, social and political – world. The Bloomsbury group is implicated in this satire by a number of details. Firstly, Lady Susan’s close friend, Lady Muriel Verschott, has something of that bohemian patroness of the Arts and Bloomsbury associate, Lady Ottoline Morrell, about her. That she is inspired at least in part by the public or semi-public reputation of the latter is suggested by the following details: her penchant for eccentric costumes and for mystical communings both with Nature and with the dead; her castle in the country to which she invites her protégés; and the fact that both she and her husband (who, like the real-life Philip Morrell, is a rather undistinguished M.P.) have regular love affairs. A specific reference to the influence of D. H. Lawrence on Lady Muriel also suggests that Jameson is drawing on gossip she may have heard from Middleton Murry, and others in Naomi Royde-Smith’s circle, about Lawrence’s involvement with Lady Ottoline at Garsington Hall.² Thus in one wonderful episode, having read too much Lawrence, Lady Verschott befriends a young farmer whom she ends up amorously chasing around an island in the dead of night. Secondly, there is an allusion to the behaviour of Woolf’s mystical and highly cultured Mrs Hilberry from *Night and Day* (1919), in an episode in which – dressed in mourning – Lady Verschott visits Shakespeare’s tomb and lays upon it a single red rose and a card with the words: ‘*From one who understands*’ (132).³ Thirdly, and perhaps most significantly from the point of view of contemporary cultural politics, allusion is made to Bloomsbury’s ties to the elite Cambridge society, the Apostles, in an episode in which Lady Susan uses her influence to ensure that a literary prize of a thousand pounds is awarded to the upper-class son of a friend (who also happens to be an Apostle), instead of to the intended recipient, a starving working-class poet called Smith.

2 For similar details in the character and life of Ottoline Morrell, see Seymour. Jameson is also likely to have read (and been influenced by) Aldous Huxley’s send-up of Garsington and the Morrells in *Crome Yellow* (1921) as well as by Lawrence’s own fictional portrait of Lady Ottoline as Hermione Roddice in *Women in Love* (1921). Like Lawrence’s Hermione, Lady Muriel is also compared to the Lady of Shalott (Jameson, *Lady* 118).

3 For Mrs Hilberry’s very similar behaviour, see Woolf, *Night*, 387, 434–5.

Introduction

When Jameson met and fell in love with Guy Chapman – the man who was to become her second husband – the year after the publication of *Lady Susan* and shortly after starting a new job as English representative for the American publisher, Alfred Knopf, she became emotionally involved with someone who, in effect, belonged to the cultural opposition.⁴ Jameson's subsequent epistolary disagreement with Valentine Dobrée, the wife of Chapman's close friend, Bonamy, over the merits or otherwise of Woolf's writing is symptomatic of the cultural divide between Jameson, on the one hand, and Chapman and his friends, on the other, particularly in the early years of their relationship.⁵ Interesting, too, given the direction that her aesthetic thinking was taking at this time, is a letter dated 23 May 1927 in which Jameson sets up a contrast between the Woolfian interiority of Valentine's literary style and her own aspiration as a writer to represent 'the confused multiplicity of life' within an exterior, material world.

It is the argument of this chapter that Jameson's 1926 novel, *Three Kingdoms*, can be read, like so many of her previous novels, both as a semi-autobiographical version of her own life at the time of writing and as an intertextual dialogue with an aspect of contemporary modernism. Taken very broadly on the level of plot, the romantic contest between a 'New Woman' and an 'Other Woman' for the loyalty of the central male character in the novel can be read as a semi-autobiographical version of Jameson's own struggle for Chapman's cultural and ideological allegiance in the early years of their relationship. Like Chapman, the central male character Dysart Ford – whose nickname 'Dy' rhymes with 'Guy' – is an upper-class southerner associated with a highly cultured group of modernist writers and artists, academics and publishers, held together by ties of birth and education. Dysart's wife, like Jameson on the other hand, is a young northern woman from a new university whose name – Laurence Storm – alludes not only to the

4 For Chapman's links to Bloomsbury, see Intro., p. 10, n. 13.

5 Valentine knew Woolf and had been a close friend of Dora Carrington until she fell out with her after she had an affair with Carrington's fiancé, Ralph Partridge, who also happened to be the Woolfs' assistant at the Hogarth Press. See Woolf, *Diary* II, 177.

author herself but also to D. H. Lawrence and who thus represents a new breed of literary meritocrats who threaten the cultural dominance of the group to which Dysart belongs and who are in turn threatened by that group.⁶ The ‘Other Woman’ in the case, Caroline Foster-Scott, was romantically involved with Dysart in his youth and is his cousin. She thus represents the residual ties of birth and cultural conditioning pulling Chapman away from Jameson. Her association with an idealist and economically privileged form of culture is symbolised by the peacock outfit in which she appears at a key moment in the novel (3Ks 211, 216).⁷ The novel also draws on other autobiographical details. For example, having survived the Great War, Dysart, like Chapman himself, suffers from shell-shock, whilst Laurence, like Jameson, has to leave her young son in order to find work, while her career in advertising draws both on Jameson’s brief experience of working in advertising immediately after the war and, more fully, on her current experience of the publishing industry.

On another level, *Three Kingdoms* can be read as Jameson writing back in a very precisely honed way to Woolf’s ‘Character in Fiction’ (1924) and *Mrs Dalloway* (1925). In this reading, the ‘Other Woman’ Caroline Foster-Scott – who also happens to be a modernist artist – becomes identified with Woolf herself both as writer and as iconic cultural figure and member of Bloomsbury. Although Jameson’s engagement with Woolf’s writing in *Three Kingdoms* is almost wholly critical (and overtly polemical), her treatment of the work of a woman as worthy of serious critical attention is, nevertheless, a significant development.⁸

6 For Dorothy L. Sayers’s cultural bracketing of the ‘middlebrow’ Lawrence, Jameson and Compton MacKenzie, as against the ‘highbrow’ Woolf, May Sinclair and Dorothy Richardson in the 1920s, see Birkett, ‘Spectacle’, 26. Despite Laurence’s nominal association with Lawrence, however, her down-to-earth attitude towards commerce is more reminiscent of that other enemy of Bloomsbury, Wyndham Lewis.

7 Jameson may also have been exorcising feelings of sexual rivalry with Chapman’s first wife whom he was still supporting financially. *Farewell to Youth* (1928) offers a far more idealised version of the same early stage in Jameson’s relationship with Chapman, while *Love in Winter* (1935) – written at a greater distance in time – offers a more measured one.

8 Although Jameson’s critical response to Woolf’s work would continue to be mixed, she would go on to lavish praise on *Orlando* and the ‘Time Passes’ section of *To the Lighthouse* (GN 50, 60–1). She had doubts about the achievement of *The Waves*, but here too recognized the ‘immitigable integrity’ of the enterprise (‘Review’ 677).

In the biography of Jameson's soon-to-be friend, the middlebrow writer, Winifred Holtby, Marion Shaw writes of her subject's 1932 critical study of Woolf's work, *Virginia Woolf: A Critical Memoir*, that it 'shows Winifred coming to terms with her own powers through a respectful and sympathetic analysis of her opposite' (Clear 247).⁹ Although characteristically more combative, Jameson's critique of Woolf's writing in *Three Kingdoms* serves a similar function: it increases her confidence in the specific value of her own role as a woman writer writing about women in a masculinist cultural climate and it clarifies her sense of the rather different kind of woman writer that she wishes to become. At the same time, the more polemical style of her critique suggests a greater degree of 'anxiety of influence' than was the case with Holtby.

In *Three Kingdoms* Jameson writes back to Woolf on two fronts. Firstly, she writes back to the aesthetic idealism that characterises Woolf's modernist account of the novel form in 'Character in Fiction' and, in particular, to the latter's attack on the socially engaged 'materialism' of Bennett, Galsworthy and Wells.¹⁰ This she does directly, in a metatextual critique of 'Character in Fiction' that occurs in one particular scene in the novel, and indirectly, through a more pervasive *revisio*ning of *Mrs Dalloway* – vision being a central trope within *Three Kingdoms*. In this *revisio*ning, Jameson reverses the aesthetic 'visibility' of Clarissa Dalloway as beautiful and cultivated society hostess, on the one hand, and Miss Kilman and Septimus Warren-Smith as grotesque meritocratic Others, on the other, bringing the latter into the foreground. In the process, Woolf's virtuoso stylistic representation of the 'flight of [Clarissa's] mind' in *Mrs Dalloway* gives place to a carnivalesque style that is Bakhtinian in its celebration of the material grotesque, as well as to a more specifically gothic development of the sub-plot of Septimus's persecution in *Mrs Dalloway*.

9 Jameson's friendship with Holtby began in 1927.

10 Woolf's attack on these three writers is curiously similar in tone to earlier idealist criticisms of the very same writers in the post-1910 *New Age*.

Secondly, in *Three Kingdoms* Jameson writes back – again in two ways – to the political and social idealism that characterises Woolf’s arch assertion of modernist rupture in ‘Character in Fiction’: ‘on or about December 1910 human character changed’ (*Essays* III 421).¹¹ Initially Jameson accepts the truth of Woolf’s polemical assertion at face value and equally polemically re-interprets it as applying to the demise of Woolf’s own privileged cultural grouping and to the rise of a new, more professional breed of cultural meritocrats. She achieves this through a revisioning of the combined fates of Woolf’s persecuted meritocrats, Miss Kilman and Septimus Warren-Smith, in the career of the successful meritocrat, Laurence Storm, who – in a move that threatens the novel’s small but dominant highbrow elite – gains control of one small area of the means of cultural production and uses her position to keep the highbrow modernist Caroline Foster-Scott/Virginia Woolf out.¹² Later, however, Jameson takes a different, less obviously polemical approach to Woolf’s utopian vision of political and cultural transformation, picking up on the theme of the ‘three kingdoms’ of wifedom, motherhood and career to argue that in reality human character does *not* change and that in a post-1910 world it is just as difficult to square the needs and desires of different social groups as it has ever been. In the process, Jameson reprises the Freudian trope of ‘blindness in seeing eyes’ that she had first used in *The Happy Highways*, using it to diagnose society’s all-pervasive blindness – including that of her own

11 It has been argued elsewhere that Woolf’s essay was significantly influenced by Carpenter’s mystical evolutionary socialism (Gerrard, ‘Brown-Ness’ 15ff.). If this view is accepted, Jameson can be seen here to be carrying on in a new guise the critique of Carpenterian idealism that she had begun in her first two novels.

12 Bloomsbury’s manner of maintaining control over their own cultural production is suggested by the married couple, Isabella and Andrew Marr. In an arrangement that is reminiscent of Virginia Woolf’s publishing arrangements with her and Leonard’s Hogarth Press, Isabella is a modernist novelist, while Andrew is the modernist editor who publishes her work. Drawing on her recent experience of the publishing industry, Jameson thus develops further the materialist analysis of cultural production she had begun in *The Pot Boils*. Although she is premature in her polemical anticipation of the demise of what Laurence Rainey has called ‘the institutions of modernism’ and the cult of the solitary genius that they fostered, she is not so far out in her evocation of an emergent, more pragmatic and overtly collaborative literary world in which what gets published is the product of a complex interaction between writers, consumers and capitalist middle-men.

heroine – to the fate of its marginalised Others. As her heroine, Laurence Storm, becomes conscious of the hitherto invisible victims of her own struggle for social and cultural visibility, she eschews her attempts to revolutionise society along meritocratic-feminist lines and opts for a pragmatic altruism that is flexible and provisional.

The basic plot of *Three Kingdoms* involves the marriage of the northern New Woman, Laurence Storm, into the Ford family, an extended southern clan resembling the Bloomsbury Group. While her husband, Dysart, is fighting in the Great War, Laurence has their child, but - seeking independence from her culturally dominant in-laws - she leaves the baby with her mother-in-law, Lady Jane Ford, and returns to London to work for a large advertising agency of which she eventually becomes a managing director. She also has an unconsummated affair with a junior diplomat who has evaded military service. Following her husband's return from the war, Laurence gets involved in a sexual and cultural clash with Dysart's cousin and erstwhile lover, Caroline Foster-Scott, who also happens to be the wife of one of Laurence's most important clients, the entrepreneur, Foster-Scott. While she succeeds in defeating Caroline both sexually and culturally, Laurence is herself (temporarily) defeated at the end of the novel by the difficulties involved in straddling the 'three kingdoms' of work, wifehood and motherhood.

This chapter begins by exploring in considerable detail the metatextual scene in which Jameson writes back to Woolf's 'Character in Fiction' and which thus provides an important interpretive key to her own aesthetic approach in the novel as a whole. It then draws attention to two prominent intertextual signposts to Jameson's revisioning of *Mrs Dalloway* in *Three Kingdoms*, before going on to examine how she uses Laurence's successful cultural battle with the Fords to revision the persecutory sub-plots of *Mrs Dalloway*'s marginalised meritocratic characters – Doris Kilman and Septimus Warren-Smith. Finally, this chapter focuses on the 'twist' at the end of the novel, in which Jameson uses the theme of the 'three kingdoms' of wifehood, motherhood and career and the Freudian theory of

'blindness in seeing eyes' to offer a more complex reply to Woolf's idealist view of social change in general and to her feminist optimism in particular.

Writing Back to Woolf's 'Character in Fiction'

In the metatextual scene from *Three Kingdoms* that writes back directly to Woolf's 'Character in Fiction', Laurence rejects modernist sketches that Caroline has drawn for an advertising campaign that she, Laurence, is running. The campaign has been commissioned by Caroline's husband, Foster-Scott, in order to promote a new canning process that he has discovered. Laurence's defence of her decision, in the row that follows, serves as a vehicle for her author's critical rejection of Woolf's modernist credo in her famous essay. Jameson offers her readers a hefty clue that advertising in this scene stands as a metaphorical vehicle for which the tenor is Art (or, more specifically, the novel), informing them that 'Laurence warmed to her theme: she might have been ... talking about art' (3Ks 161). Adopting the voice of her besieged heroine, Jameson writes back to 'Character in Fiction' on three fronts. She attacks the essay's anti-materialist attitudes and the unspoken assumptions of privilege that underlie them; she exposes the discrepancy between Woolf's theoretical cultural egalitarianism – as expressed both in her essay and in her collection, *The Common Reader* (1925) – and the literary elitism of her modernist fiction; and she rejects Woolf's famous assertion in 'Character in Fiction' that social engagement and political persuasion do not belong in the novel as an aesthetic form.

The picture of the ideal modernist novelist conjured up by Woolf in 'Character in Fiction' is that of a being so preoccupied with the spiritual or psychological pursuit of Mrs Brown that she pays little or no attention to her own 'happiness, comfort, or income', yet Woolf's own class privilege is unwittingly revealed both in her assumption that 'one' has enough income to employ a cook to attend to one's 'happiness' and 'comfort' instead, and in her later class-specific analogy between the novelist and the society hostess entertaining

her guests to tea (*Essays* III 422, 431).¹³ Jameson amusingly captures and exaggerates this combination of class and aesthetic superiority in the ‘infinite condescension’ of Caroline’s tone as she makes ‘a great song about having to prostitute her art’ and utters such supremely arrogant remarks as: ‘You see, I live among people who know’ (3Ks 156, 163).¹⁴ Laurence, on the other hand, ‘earn[s] [her] living in the market-place, and ... do[es]n’t expect preferential treatment’ (3Ks 164). The reader is thus led to sympathise with Laurence’s later lament: ‘What are you to do with a woman who comes out into a hard cold world trailing the traditions of the drawing-room behind her?’ (3Ks 169).

Woolf’s attitude of social and aesthetic superiority (bred as it was of her own insecurities) clearly irks Jameson, yet she also has more serious points to make regarding the social and economic position of the artist. Where Woolf implies that the highbrow novelist’s disengagement from material considerations allows her to acquire a more spiritually acute ‘skill in character-reading’, Jameson takes further Woolf’s own admission – in passing – that even ‘business largely depends on [character-reading]’, arguing that the ‘impure’ materialist pressures of the modern market-place are, in fact, a far better school than a life of leisure and intellectual contemplation for the development of such an art (*Essays* III 421). Thus the nouveau-riche entrepreneur Foster-Scott ‘read faces as clever men read books’ and Laurence’s ability to make ‘curious passionate little dashes into the mind of complete strangers’ is at least partially responsible for her own commercial success, while of the highbrow Caroline we are told that although she could get her material ‘all correct, down to the minutest detail, provided she could get it out of books ... suppose she tried to ... translate it into terms of actual life ... she’d go wildly wrong’ because ‘she’s got no *sense*’ (3Ks 75, 135, 265).¹⁵ If this were not explicit enough, Jameson

13 For an account of Woolf’s difficulties in squaring her socialist ideals with her material requirements, see Light, *Mrs. Woolf*.

14 Life later imitated art when – in a diary entry for 31 May 1938 – Woolf described Jameson as ‘one of the old Prostitutes’ (*Diary* V 147).

15 Compare Jameson’s later complaint regarding Woolf that ‘her genius, carefully tended, pruned, enriched, has no roots in our common earth’ (GN 62). Holtby argues similarly that ‘the immense detailed knowledge of the material circumstances of life ... is beyond [Woolf]. She will remain ... shut off from

has Laurence's co-director assert that the good advertising man must 'know more about the value of words and the psychology of his fellow-men and women than an intellectual novelist learns in a lifetime' (3Ks 300).

In 'Character in Fiction' Woolf also expresses the theoretically egalitarian view that it is the writer's job to find 'some means of *bridging* the gulf' between writer and reader and that he 'must get into touch with his reader by putting before him something which he *recognizes*, which therefore stimulates his *imagination*' (italics added, *Essays* III 431). Although Jameson wholeheartedly agrees with this argument, she turns it against Woolf's own aesthetic practice when she has Laurence single out for criticism Caroline's sketch of 'an exquisite Columbine' (3Ks 161). In its allusion to Bloomsbury's love-affair with the high art of the Russian Ballet and with the stylized designs of Bakst in particular, this sketch serves as a symbol both for Woolf's highbrow elitism and for her modernist formalism.¹⁶ Echoing the terms of Woolf's theoretical argument (and continuing the analogy between advertising and novel-writing), Laurence rejects Caroline's Columbine sketch precisely because it fails to 'keep some sort of a *bridge* between the advertisement [novel] and the person you hope will look at [read] it' and because 'by no leap of her *imagination* could any housewife [common reader] arrive at *identifying* herself with' such an exquisite figure (italics added, 3Ks 161).

Jameson may also have in mind here George Eliot's classic defence of social realism in *Adam Bede*. Certainly her argument is very similar to Eliot's. In her defence of social realism, Eliot rejects both angel and Madonna as possible literary subjects, choosing instead as her equivalent of Mrs Brown the rough figures of old women 'scraping carrots with their work-worn hands' (Eliot 224).¹⁷ In *Three Kingdoms* Laurence rejects Caroline's angel-like female figure in favour of a modern equivalent to Eliot's female domestic worker, 'the

intimate contact with Hilda Thomas of Putney and Edgar J. Watkiss, who lays lead piping among the bowels of Bond Street' (qtd. in Shaw, *Clear* 249).

16 See, for example, a screen decorated by Duncan Grant on which Maynard Keynes and his wife, the ballet dancer Lydia Lopokhova, appear as Harlequin and Columbine (Watney 36).

17 In addition to her recurrent comparison of the 'Other Woman' to a peacock, Jameson also frequently compared her to an angel or Madonna. For examples of this practice, see 3Ks, 11; JN1, 116; and GN, 62.

London-Leeds-Roxborough housewife' who buys tinned food for convenience (3Ks 161). The effect of such an allusion is, arguably, twofold: firstly, it provides cultural authority for Jameson's criticism of the social limitations of Woolf's feminism and, secondly, it hints at an alternative literary tradition of cultural outsiders in touch with common life – George Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, Storm Jameson – a tradition akin to that more vociferously promoted by the Leavises over a decade later.

In both 'Character in Fiction' and *The Common Reader* Woolf also addresses the notion of an egalitarian process of communication between writer and reader from the reader's side, by making a case for cultural consumer-rights and arguing that the contemporary novel is 'corrupte[d] and emasculate[d]' by the humility of a general public that allows writers to palm off on it 'an image of Mrs Brown which has no likeness to that surprising apparition whatsoever' (*Essays* III 436). However, Caroline's peremptory reply to Laurence's accusation that her art fails to take the ordinary housewife's concerns into account – 'I cannot be dictated to in a matter of this kind' (3Ks 162) – is closer to the Woolf who in practice records in her diary for 1921 that she writes for 'half a dozen instead of 1500' (*Diary* II 107).

In *Three Kingdoms* Jameson uses the metaphorical vehicle of advertising – the art of persuasion – to write back directly to Woolf's view that the novel form was not designed 'to preach doctrines' but was an aesthetic end in itself (*Essays* III 425). In a tongue-in-cheek reference to this famous attack on the social commitment of the 'materialist' Galsworthy, Bennett and Wells, Jameson has Caroline observe sarcastically of Laurence's tendency to moral earnestness, 'Do you, as they say, testify in Salvation Army meetings?', a tendency to which Laurence later ruefully admits: 'Damn the woman ... she gets home alright. I do talk like a revivalist' (3Ks 164–5).¹⁸ Nevertheless, in *Three Kingdoms* Jameson is unapologetic

18 Compare Lawrence's ironic acceptance of a similar charge against himself in the guise of the semi-autobiographical Birkin in *Women in Love* (143). Behind this difference of opinion between Bloomsbury, on the one hand, and writers like Lawrence and Jameson, on the other, regarding the function of the novel, lies Matthew Arnold's attack on 'Hebraic' northern nonconformity in *Culture and Anarchy*.

about her belief in the social function of art, even while she is more ambivalent about the value of advertising in the novel as a whole than the particular episode under discussion might suggest. As far as the tinned-food advertising campaign is concerned, the supremely cynical Foster-Scott sees it (with a degree of prescience) as part of a capitalist process of multiplying ‘greeds and wants’ that will eventually lead to the self-combustion of the industrialised world (3Ks 193–4). Alternatively, for Laurence tinned food exemplifies the real social benefits of mass-production and her campaign is aimed both at alerting the urban poor to the availability of affordable luxuries that have previously only been available to the wealthy and at persuading modern women that buying these commodities will free up time from onerous household chores.¹⁹ In the scene under consideration, Jameson uses this more positive view of the art of persuasion to make a case for novels with a specifically socialist-feminist agenda. Thus Laurence argues that Caroline’s sketches (or the socialist-feminist novel) should show the housewife ‘an idealised vision of herself, of course. But a vision of *herself*, someone she might conceivably become’ (3Ks 161).

Revisioning *Mrs Dalloway*, Redistributing Cultural Power

As well as being a mouthpiece for her author’s aesthetic arguments in the above scene, Jameson’s heroine also embodies those arguments, offering a ‘materialist’ alternative to Woolf’s fictional ‘Columbine’, Clarissa Dalloway. Presented in an accessibly realist style, Laurence Storm is a more imperfect figure than the upper-class Clarissa, a ‘creature’ that has been ‘flung ... out with all its imperfections on its head’, and one that is possibly easier for the average woman reader to identify with (3Ks 114). She is also ‘unfinished’ or embryonic and thus serves as a persuasive example of women’s potential for self-transformation, with its attendant risks and uncertainties.²⁰ That the provincial and

19 For a characteristically provocative account of the modernist intellectual’s obsession with tinned food as a symbol of the threat posed by mass-production to the uniqueness of the individual, see Carey, 21–2.

20 A tendency towards stasis is, perhaps, what worried Jameson most about Woolf’s characters. Thus in a later review of *The Waves* (1931), she would complain that ‘though their movements are described [they] remain static’ (677).

meritocratic heroine of *Three Kingdoms* is deliberately offered as an alternative to the metropolitan and socially privileged Clarissa Dalloway is suggested by the image of Laurence Storm, like Clarissa at the opening of Woolf's novel, standing on the kerb of a London street waiting to cross. Placed in exactly the same context as Woolf's heroine, Laurence has none of Clarissa's poise. Where the latter stands waiting 'very upright', an elegant and ethereal metropolitan in her natural habitat, 'a touch of the bird about her, of the jay, blue-green, light, vivacious' (*MD* 5), Laurence Storm is 'a country-bred youngster' – reminiscent, in some ways, of both Mansfield's 'little governess' and de la Mare's Miss Midget – who 'stand[s] nervously on the kerb, terrified and awkward in the maelstrom of London traffic' (*3Ks* 321).

A second major intertextual signpost to Jameson's revisioning of *Mrs Dalloway* comes in the form of a scene from *Three Kingdoms* that directly echoes the royal car sequence in Woolf's novel. Jameson's version of this sequence foregrounds a major cultural and economic shift that Woolf appeared reluctant to confront in *Mrs Dalloway*, despite her witty exploitation of new advertising strategies for her own purposes in the sky-writing episode of the novel. In *Three Kingdoms* the car that Laurence, Dysart, his sister Isabel, and his brother-in-law Andrew Marr, are travelling in traces the same route as the royal car in *Mrs Dalloway*. Its destination, however, is not Buckingham Palace but a dinner party at the house of the nouveau riche Foster-Scott. Instead of Woolf's royal car, there is a common or garden lorry that breaks down. The arch tone of the narrative, the 'imperturbable English crowd' and the Woolfian policeman offer further clues to the passage's intertextual freight:

Andrew Marr's car emerged stealthily into Piccadilly and slid into the stream of traffic going west. At the foot of the hill that slopes adorably from Devonshire House past the Green Park [St. James's Street], it was halted by a small gentlemanly riot in progress round a broken-down lorry ... The traffic was held up down illimitable avenues and the confusion seemed without issue, but no one fussed. The imperturbable English crowd waited for God to interfere by the hand of His police sergeant to help them. (*3Ks* 105)

The text continues to echo Woolf's version with a difference. In *Mrs Dalloway*, 'tall ... well-dressed men ... [are] standing in the bow window of White's ... ready to attend their Sovereign, if need be, to the cannon's mouth, as their ancestors ha[ve] done before them' (*MD* 18). In *Three Kingdoms*, too, the car passes the clubs of Piccadilly, but beneath the apparently tranquil surface change is under way. Andrew 'screw[s] round in his seat to regard the place where old Q *once* sat under an umbrella and ogled the passing fair', but when he waves at what appears to be a reincarnation of 'old Q' on the steps of his club, 'the immaculate ancient ... disappear[s] with startling suddenness', leaving the narrator to contemplate the revolutionary possibility that 'he had rolled into the area, where his body would be dragged out of sight and thrown into the sewers' (*italics added*, *3K* 105).

There is one further notable difference. The awkward circumlocution used to denote St. James's Street in the *Three Kingdoms* version – 'the hill that slopes adorably from Devonshire House past the Green Park' – is designed to direct the contemporary reader's attention to the symbolic significance of Devonshire House itself. Recalling the longevity of Woolf's clubmen, this imposing Palladian mansion had been the Piccadilly residence of the Dukes of Devonshire, one of England's most prominent aristocratic families, for around two hundred years. In *Mrs Dalloway*, Devonshire House is mentioned early on in the novel in relation to Clarissa's memories of 'coming out' in her youth (*MD* 10). Yet by 1923, the year in which Woolf's novel is set, the house no longer existed in its original form, having been sold off to property developers in 1919. Although this circumstance is not mentioned in *Mrs. Dalloway*, it was significant enough to merit two articles in the *New York Times*, 'Duke of Devonshire Sells Famous House' (6 Sept. 1919) and 'Turn Duke's Mansion over to the Movies' (16 May 1920). The latter article informs readers that the plan is to turn the home of one of the finest art collections in the United Kingdom into 'the most gigantic pleasure house in London' containing one or two 'lavish' cinemas 'on American lines' (17). Devonshire House thus serves as a symbol of a shift away from the culture of the 'Great House' and towards a more popular culture that was already well

advanced by the beginning of the post-war period. Further emphasizing the notion of a cultural shift, at the dinner party that follows, the modern entrepreneur, Foster-Scott, silently reflects of his gentlemanly guests: 'Taste was born with you and will die stinking in your graves' (3Ks 115).

Polemically illustrating the above cultural shift, Jameson revises the fates of *Mrs Dalloway's* two persecuted meritocrats, Doris Kilman and Septimus Warren-Smith, in her account of the various stages of Laurence's cultural victory over the Fords, as mentioned earlier. Laurence can be read as a much more politically and culturally astute version of Miss Kilman (who, in turn, might just possibly be Woolf's idea of the author of *Lady Susan*), in that, like Miss Kilman, she is an outsider who has come to live with a family belonging to the southern educational and cultural elite; a meritocrat who has been educated at a new university; an individual concerned with social justice and hence associated with a certain northern earnestness; and – worst of all – a woman who is anti-aesthetic, dressing badly and being insensitive to music. Yet where Miss Kilman is presented as a victim of social and cultural persecution by Woolf, her Jamesonian *alter ego*, Laurence Storm, is a proactive example of cultural resistance and self-development, who – in her battle with the *status quo* – exemplifies a wider social change.

Underpinning Jameson's revisioning of Woolf's Miss Kilman plot is an analysis of the nature and acquisition of cultural capital and of its relation to symbolic violence that draws on Woolf's own powerful insights regarding the ways in which we construct our sense of self through our relations to others and takes them further, anticipating the much later sociological theories of Pierre Bourdieu. The setting for this analysis is the Bloomsbury-like cultural milieu of the Ford clan. Exhibiting an easy familiarity with the avant-garde, these people have an unusually large supply of cultural capital. People give Gertler paintings as presents and buy their painted furniture from 'an expensive Workshop' resembling Fry's

Omega Workshop (3Ks 33–4).²¹ In an allusion to Lawrence’s ‘The Crown’, one piece of furniture is ‘decorated with green unicorns’, symbolically drawing attention to Bloomsbury’s position on the idealist side of the contemporary idealist-materialist divide (3Ks 33).

In ‘A Mark on the Wall’ (1919), Woolf uses the looking-glass as a metaphor for the reflections we receive back from the gaze of others and that are crucial to our sense of self. In *Mrs Dalloway*, she suggests how Miss Kilman interiorizes the vision of herself as cultural Other that she sees reflected in Clarissa’s critical gaze, and how that gaze thus acts as a form of cultural policing. Thus, as she ‘lurches’ both out of the Army and Navy Stores and out of the novel, Miss Kilman sees herself very much as Clarissa sees her – ‘with her hat askew, very red in the face, full-length in the looking-glass’ – and feels hounded out by her, for ‘Mrs Dalloway had triumphed’ (MD 118). In the following vignettes from *Three Kingdoms*, Jameson echoes Woolf’s use of the critical gaze and the looking-glass as figures for the manner in which ‘symbolic violence’ is directed against – and experienced by – the cultural outsider:

Dysart and Isabel [his sister] had drawn together and were observing [Laurence] with faint amused curiosity at her antics. Under that gaze, aloof and impersonally malicious, Dysart’s wife felt clumsy and unfinished. She stumbled against a chair as she crossed the room, and blushing, slipped through the door with a groping hand on the wall. (3Ks 357)

‘You’re a vulgar beast,’ she told the Laurence Storm who faced her in the glass ...
‘You *look* all right still,’ she said. ‘It doesn’t show.’

There was a beauty she was missing and a dignity lost. She imagined Isabel an onlooker ... and shuddered. (3Ks 93)

In *Mrs Dalloway*, Miss Kilman’s role as passive victim of this discreet but powerful form of social persecution is cast in stone and there is never any sense that she can help herself; in *Three Kingdoms*, however, Laurence’s agency is constantly emphasized.²² On arriving at

21 Jameson may have in mind Wyndham Lewis’s notorious split with Roger Fry over the Omega Workshop. Her fictional Workshop is satirically described – in terms worthy of Lewis – as a place where ‘cultured young men and women became broody, sat down over a new Aesthetic and hatched out a progeny which they fed like the pious pelican with their own blood and sold for a great price to Bradford millionaires, adventurous old ladies and pronounced Jews’ (3Ks 34).

22 It is significant, on the other hand, that Woolf *does* endow Septimus Warren-Smith with agency (and with a far higher degree of authorial sympathy), for Septimus has aesthetic credentials: not only does he

the Fords' country house, the timeless 'Midsummer Hall', Laurence discovers a talent for cultural mimicry. Having studied the manners of the Fords with the professionalism of an anthropologist, after only a month she could 'confidently have entered a London shop ... and given an admirable mime of Lady Jane Ford's insolent and knowledgeable courtesy' (3Ks 12). This talent for cultural mimicry gives Laurence a choice to 'pass' that Woolf's Miss Kilman does not possess, but it is a choice that she actively refuses. More ideologically sophisticated than Miss Kilman, Laurence is aware, in Bourdieu's terms, that 'the definition of art, and through it of the art of living, is an object of struggle among the classes' and that the southern cultural elite's definition of these things must, therefore, be resisted (Bourdieu, *Distinction* 48). Hence she frequently points out to the Fords the effect of their (at least partially unconscious) symbolic violence in remarks such as the following: 'You always keep your form, don't you. Did it ever occur to you how trying it might be for a barbarian like myself to live up to you?'; 'All you people – You hurt me. You *hurt* me'; and – emphasising the trope of the gaze – 'If I got completely unintelligent, would I be invisible ...?' (3Ks 185). More importantly, she forcefully draws attention to her own visibility in her own terms, 'I'm a real person. I'm me – Laurence Storm' (not Laurence Ford), and – rejecting the Fords' anti-materialist values – she enters the commercial market-place in order to 'be ... someone' (3Ks 14, 18).

In her account of her female meritocrat's adventure into the world of the modern market-place, Jameson experiments with a materialist carnivalesque as an aesthetic antidote both to Bloomsbury's idealist modernism and to the gothic mechanism of abjection. In the process, she turns Woolf's cruel exposure of Miss Kilman's greedy desire for iced buns in *Mrs Dalloway* into a comic celebration of the flawed nature of our common humanity. Her account conjures up all 'the dirt and rout of the fair' (3Ks 388). It contains 'peep-shows', 'spectacles', 'lubber-fiends', innumerable clowns and, above all, innumerable

attend evening classes on Shakespeare before the war, but he also chooses a southern, Italian wife who 'stigmatize[s]' 'ill-dressing' and has 'artist's fingers' (MD 78).

pigs (3Ks 216, 273, 362). That Jameson is thinking of Rabelais is suggested by references to Pantagruel and Gargantua (3Ks 113, 190), and indeed her use of the idea of carnival has something in common with the Rabelaisian model as it would be interpreted by Bakhtin over a decade later: it involves a strategic celebration of the marginalised grotesque body and of folk laughter to bring about 'the defeat of power, ... of the earthly upper classes, of all that oppresses and restricts' (*Rabelais* 92).

Clearly a carnivalesque world of modern commerce raises ethical issues, of which Jameson's heroine eventually becomes aware. Nevertheless, Jameson is making a politically astute point about the difference between the public, if unclean, world of commerce and Bloomsbury's private world of the civilised individual when she associates the Fords with the entirely different, modernist version of carnival she had herself encountered in the high art of Diaghlev's *Scheherazade* (JNI 62). Thus, alongside Caroline's sketch of Columbine, there is a comparison of Dysart himself to Harlequin (3Ks 403). Although such figures were 'once robust and outrageous carnival clowns', in modernism they have become 'the etiolated reverie of high culture, the wan and wistful symbols of anomic disenchantment with bourgeois life' and in this way, too, they have become 'privatized' and 'cut off from social protest' (White 55).

In contrast to the spiritual idealism of the Fords/Bloomsbury group who are 'queerly untouchable by the ugliness of living', Jameson's representation of the market-place emphasises the material body, greed, sex and defecation; in contrast to the severance of the aesthetic gaze, it emphasizes community, bodily contact and the transgression of physical boundaries (3Ks 15). Thus Laurence 'shared a bed with a film actress who oiled herself all over every night with olive oil and slid into bed like a seal' during her early days of poverty; her office window opens onto 'the mingled stench of gutter and roadway'; she indulges in repartee with 'the thick tongues of her opponents'; she advertises to consumers whose 'tongues are hanging out for lust of food'; and she pits 'the passive allure of her body against the dominating allure of [the male]' (3Ks 62, 77, 84, 97, 108). Above all, a

proliferation of pig imagery symbolises the predominance of human greed both as the motor of the advertising industry and within the market-place as a whole. Laurence herself is ‘a conceited, commercial-minded pig’; the arch-capitalist, Foster-Scott, is a ‘greedy destructive swine’; Laurence’s fellow managing-director, Macdougall, is a ‘savage boar’; and, in general, there are ‘a lot of swine rooting about town nowadays’ (3Ks 39, 110, 225, 324).²³ Here Stallybrass and White’s modification of Bakhtin’s carnivalesque into a theory of ‘transgression’ is of relevance, in particular their reflection that ‘part of the transgressive excitement of the fair for the subordinate classes was ... the introduction of a certain cosmopolitanism, arousing desires and excitements for exotic and strange commodities’ (37). Foster Scott’s discovery of a way of preserving food so that it ‘tastes like fresh’ promises a means of fulfilling such transgressive desires, making available to the masses a very close equivalent to experiences previously only accessible to the Fords of this world (3Ks 77).

As in Bakhtin’s carnivalesque – and in contrast to what Jameson sees as Woolf’s fundamentally static social model (as exemplified by the timeless world of *Midsummer Hall*) – for most of the novel the modern-day market-place is presented as a continually changing, egalitarian world of play. In this world, the gutter is celebrated as a place of communal energy, in which no one can escape being ‘rolled ... with leveller’s zeal’ (3Ks 108). And here Jameson – in a direct echo from *Mrs Dalloway* – marks a central difference between her heroine and Woolf’s. Like Clarissa, Laurence is said to possess an extraordinary vitality and to love ‘life’ (MD 6, 8; 3Ks 27, 109), but where Clarissa observes the life of the streets, including the romanticised figure of the beggar singing by the Tube, with a severing gaze – ‘slic[ing] like a knife through everything; at the same time ... outside, looking on (MD 9) – Laurence would ‘play anywhere it amused her’, ‘hobnobbing with all

23 For a fascinating discussion of pig symbolism, see Stallybrass and White, Chapter 1. Their rhetorical question, ‘Was not ... the aim of every educated bourgeois subject – to get as far away from the smell of the pigsty as possible?’ (52), casts an interesting light both on Woolf’s remark about Holtby ‘minding the pigs’ (see Intro., p.6) and on Jameson’s cultural appropriation of pig imagery in *Three Kingdoms*.

and sundry' (3Ks 109). As Laurence herself points out: 'If I was the beautiful Mrs Foster Scott I'd have to be more careful, of course, but being only Laurence Storm I can go on playing with my low friends in the gutter' (3Ks 109).

Her creativity released by this lawless world, unlike the broken Miss Kilman, Laurence becomes a charismatic role-player full of 'secret laughter', a 'jeering young gutter-snipe', a 'little mimic' who 'ought to have been on the halls' (3Ks 109, 169, 272). Most importantly, this lawless material world allows Laurence space to grow so that 'the movement of ... her whole body sent out a disturbing thrill of new life' (3Ks 27). The politically challenging new feminist power that she represents is suggested by her declaration to her husband, Dysart, that 'more and more girl children are being born like me with an instinct for freedom ... Nothing, neither apathy nor men's resentment ... can stand against that. You may hate it and obstruct it but you can't kill it' (3Ks 181). Yet, following the lesson learned by Elizabeth in *The Clash*, there is one crucial respect in which Laurence holds herself aloof from the carnival: she may exploit her sexual allure, and indeed she has an extra-marital affair, yet as a successful New Woman she keeps a firm rein on her own sexual desires, withholding her sexual favours from both husband and lover.

Although the aestheticist Fords *appear* 'untouchable by the ugliness of living', they are as implicated in the material as anyone else. Thus it is only when Laurence experiences the 'ease' of life at Midsummer Hall that she becomes aware that in her northern home 'there had never ... been anything to eat or drink that could really be called eating and drinking' (3Ks 12). More significantly, Dysart's 'greedy sensitive face' is described at a concert as 'leaning a little forward' and 'seeming to suck music out of the very air' (3Ks 311). His desire for music is thus represented as no different from any other form of consumption. Caroline, too, is 'as greedy as the rest of us' when it comes to desiring love and admiration, and whilst sophisticatedly cool on the outside, is inwardly 'grovelling in the fires of the body' in her desire for Dysart (3Ks 118, 157). The carnivalesque image of bodily waste is also associated with the noble Sir James, father of both Andrew and Nicholas Marr, who –

in his anger at his younger son's desire to marry Laurence – 'dived deeper and deeper into the cesspool that had received the drainings from his reverence for Woman' (3Ks 262).²⁴

Once Laurence has established herself as 'someone' in the commercial field, the second phase of her cultural battle is unleashed when she rejects Caroline's sketches and thus unwittingly draws attention to the waning of the cultural power that has previously allowed the Ford clan to gratify their desires in an elegant and socially approved manner. In the story of Caroline's retaliatory action, Jameson writes back to the story of Septimus Warren-Smith's persecution in *Mrs Dalloway*. In so doing, she argues that Bloomsbury is just as capable of an abuse of power to protect its cultural position as Woolf's fictional Harley Street specialist, Sir William Bradshaw, is to protect his social position in *Mrs Dalloway*. If this accusation seems unfair and exaggerated, it is worth recalling Alex Zwerdling's observation that 'like any other powerful class, [Bloomsbury] soon developed a private network of communication and influence, of nepotism ... that effectively excluded all but the most exceptional interlopers' – none of whom, it could be added, were likely to have been the northern daughters of uneducated men (92). While Woolf (by virtue of her own gender) may have had an unusually critical take on her hereditary caste as Zwerdling goes on to observe, Jameson's reproach is that she did not dissociate herself more actively from its attitudes and behaviours.²⁵

Laurence may be compared to Septimus – as opposed to that more self-doubting outsider, Doris Kilman – in the strength of her 'difference' of view, which challenges a hegemonic version of reality. Her boundary-threatening modernity, like Septimus's shell-shock, unleashes extreme fear and menace so that, again like Septimus, she is hunted down in an act of ideological policing and, as a result, experiences a fall from a high building – though in her case the fall is metaphorical – the anticipated loss of her job:

24 Sewage and sewers are an important subliminal motif in *Three Kingdoms*. For an apposite discussion of 'The City: the Sewer, the Gaze and the Contaminating Touch', see Stallybrass and White, Chapter 3.

25 For a more sympathetic view of Woolf's active social commitment, see Cuddy-Keane, *Intellectual*.

It was rather like hearing that an earthquake had destroyed the whole of the Napier Advertising Service. But the Napier Service stood rooted and it was she who had been flung off at a tangent and *was falling, down and down, in apprehension of final crushing death.* (italics added, 3Ks 210)

Where, in *Mrs Dalloway*, Woolf leaves it unclear to what extent Septimus's sense of persecution is based on an objective assessment of reality and to what extent it is a function of his 'madness', however, in *Three Kingdoms* Laurence's gothic persecution is clearly granted objective status since it is observed by others, rather than by herself.²⁶ Thus Laurence's brother-in-law, Andrew, has 'so vivid and shocking a feeling of imminent danger' surrounding her that his forehead becomes wet with sweat and he nearly calls out a warning in the middle of a polite social function (3Ks 117). Laurence's co-director, Macdougall, too, smells 'danger in the air' which in some way that he cannot fathom threatens her well-being, while a 'dark shadow' lurks in the passage outside the hotel suite where Laurence and Foster-Scott are working at night, 'startling [their secretary] out of her wits' so that she 'stifle[s] a scream and locks herself in her room' (3Ks 129, 189).

More importantly for Jameson's argument, the 'difference' of view which causes Laurence to become an object of persecution is the very opposite of Septimus's. In Woolf's modernist plot, the meritocratic Septimus is hunted down because he embodies an extreme idealism that threatens the *political and social* status quo. While this idealism may be allied to madness, it is also associated with a rare degree of aesthetic sensibility and could, it is suggested, be made right by a little human kindness. In *Three Kingdoms*, on the other hand, Laurence is hunted down because she embodies a commercial pragmatism that is precisely the *opposite* of Septimus's idealism and aestheticism and that threatens a highbrow *cultural* status quo. Thus, in a scene that alludes to Woolf's satire on the Harley Street psychiatrist, Sir William Bradshaw, when Dysart complains about being placed in an ethically

26 Septimus's view of human beings has gothic/expressionist overtones: 'They hunt in packs. Their packs scour the desert and vanish screaming into the wilderness' (MD 80). The equivocal status of his judgment of his fellows is suggested by allusions to *Hamlet*.

impossible situation by his boss, 'J.W.', Jameson has Laurence come down on the side of Bradshaw's (and J.W.'s) 'goddess' Proportion (*MD* 89):

"I spoke to J.W. about it: he laughed ... and said: 'Well, my dear, what do you suggest? ... Proportion, my dear, always proportion. Do you take enough exercise, Dy? Exercise and a gentle regulation of the body is the surest safeguard against emotional excess I know.' What are you to do with a man who feels like that?"

"Listen to him, my little love. He's talking sense. You can't play Savonarola in a rotten world. You haven't time."

Dysart stared at [Laurence]. (*3Ks* 298)

In Laurence's case, it is precisely those with superior aesthetic sensibility who become the persecutors. Furthermore, Jameson makes it clear that, despite their theoretical idealism, the material interests of London's cultural elite tie them indissolubly to a corrupt Establishment. In so doing, she disallows the comforting possibility – arguably suggested at the end of *Mrs Dalloway* – that Clarissa's superior sensibility absolves her of any responsibility for social injustice. In her effort to get Laurence the sack, Caroline uses her family connections, applying for help to Mr. Manuel, an Oxford don and friend of her father's, who happens conveniently to be a non-executive director on the board of Laurence's advertising agency. Mr. Manuel is 'a kind man, a religious sceptic, a gentleman and a mild Whig', recalling the unworldly academic figures of Mr. Pepper and Uncle Ridley in *The Voyage Out* or the learned elderly gentlemen who come to tea with the Hilberrys in *Night and Day* (*3Ks* 272). His occasional attendance at meetings of the advertising agency's board prior to Laurence's promotion had given him manageable glimpses of a world of conflicting material and cultural interests – 'a little peep through a rarely-visited window' – from which his sheltered life in an Oxford college protects him (*3Ks* 273). It is only when Laurence's success as a New Woman obliges him to face up to 'the political forces of menace and disorder' which threaten his own leisured existence (*3Ks* 273), that something akin to Sir William Bradshaw's Darwinian urge to 'swoop', 'devour' and 'shut people up' emerges from under his mild, cultivated exterior (*MD* 91):

[Mr Manuel] wanted to hunt [Laurence] down and kill her, get rid of her, blot her out. Some very ancient instinct woke and mingled with his nervous dread of the new malignant world where she belonged. She was quarry, a wild thing to be hunted, the sign and symbol of dissolving decencies and sanctities defiled. Up and hunt her! (3Ks 273)

Laurence's defeat of Mr. Manuel (and hence Caroline) at a tense and dramatic board meeting is thus a sign that there is a new wind blowing, for the board accepts as a fundamental principle the basis of Laurence's defence against Caroline's complaint, namely that there should not be 'one law for the professional and another for the amateur' (3Ks 275).

Problematising Partisan Positions

In a final twist in the novel, Jameson re-examines both highbrow and middlebrow partisan positions, by writing back to the utopian optimism of Woolf's famous assertion of political and cultural rupture altogether and arguing for a more complex analysis of the nature and difficulty of social change. This final twist – in which Laurence, like Joy in *The Happy Highways*, loses her 'blindness in seeing eyes' – reveals a Nietzschean vision of the economics of power in which the desires of different individuals and different social groups prove not so easily reconciled and in which losers always remain. This materialist vision is suggested as the full complexity of the metaphorical game of murder-in-the-dark that is the novel's gothic subtext begins to emerge. It thus turns out that – besides being the victim of persecution – in her struggle to reconcile the demands of the 'three kingdoms' of wifedom, motherhood and career, Laurence as 'New Woman' has herself committed her fair share of murders, and that the real question that has to be faced is not whether 'murders' can be averted, but who are to be the victims?

Jameson offers a clue to the fact that she is writing back to Woolf's utopianism – and more particularly to her feminism – here, by a pointed allusion to one specific example of modernist rupture in 'Character in Fiction', namely that of the change that has occurred in readers' responses to Aeschylus's Greek tragedy, the *Agamemnon*, since December 1910. In the *Agamemnon*, of course, Clytemnestra famously murders her husband, Agamemnon, on

his return from the Trojan War in revenge for his ritual sacrifice of their daughter at his departure. In 'Character in Fiction', Woolf argues that the sympathies of the more 'feminist' modern reader are now 'almost entirely with Clytemnestra' (*Essays* III 422). Picking up on this allusion to the *Agamemnon*, in *Three Kingdoms* Laurence is said to 'murder' her husband, Dysart, by her neglectful treatment of him on his return from the war, having already ritually sacrificed their son to the pursuit of her career (3Ks 119). However, far from justifying Laurence's behaviour as a revolutionary assertion of a modern 'feminist' independence, the authorial voice in *Three Kingdoms* writes back to Woolf, reflecting that 'there was *nothing new under the sun by which moderns may mark their modernity*: Clytemnestra did it' (italics added, 3Ks 119). Jameson is not being anti-progressive here, but is arguing, rather, for a more realistic recognition of the difficulty and cost of change, given the fact that *all* human beings have needs and desires and that – contrary to the Carpenterian picture that Woolf evokes of 'masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children' all equally spiritually fulfilled in some modern utopia – not *all* these needs and desires can be reconciled (*Essays* III 422).

The final twist in the novel comes when - in conformity to a persecutory gothic form in which the persecutor's 'power of retaliation is seemingly infinite' – Caroline launches a second, more deviously indirect attack on Laurence's career (Punter, *Gothic* 119). This time Caroline cites Laurence as 'the Intervener' in her own divorce suit against her husband, Foster-Scott, a blatantly false accusation to which Laurence has exposed herself by working with Foster-Scott late into the night. In *Rabelais and his World*, Bakhtin observes that 'fear can only enter a part that has been separated from the whole' (256). However, refusing to idealise carnival, Allon White draws attention to the phenomenon of 'displaced abjection', whereby 'an oppressed group uses carnival to invert its own low position with respect to another even weaker group, often women or ethnic minorities' ('Pigs' 67). In *Three Kingdoms*, while Laurence continues to feel part of the contemporary carnival she is without fear, happily ignoring the threats that surround her. However, Caroline's attack on her

sexual reputation brings about just such an experience of ‘displaced abjection’ as White describes. In spite of the fact that (for a series of reasons that are irrelevant to this discussion) she ends up defeating Caroline in court, Laurence loses her good name as a woman – becoming the object of the common gossip of the market place, reduced to the status of ‘hot stuff, a vulgar bitch, another of Foster Scott’s, the tart Dysart Ford married’ – and faces the prospect of expulsion from her place in the commercial world as a consequence. It is at this point that she begins to experience the feelings of fear and exposure that are the lot of the victim of gothic persecution: ‘Every human being needs one sure refuge, thought Laurence, one place where he is sure without question of shelter and support ... at any time, in any danger – and what place have I?’ (3Ks 211). Complete abjection finally comes when it occurs to Laurence that her loss of reputation may propel her neglected husband back into the arms of his former lover, Caroline. Reaching her nadir, in a passage that picks up on earlier uses both of the ‘looking-glass’ trope and of the notion of social exclusion, Laurence is described as ‘rock[ing] backwards and forwards like a frightened old woman’ as she contemplates ‘her own white frightened face in the glass’ and informs ‘her thin shaking reflection’ that she ‘would have to go’ (3Ks 250).²⁷

Laurence’s moment of complete abjection brings about a psychological change similar to that undergone by Joy following his experience of the Great War in *The Happy Highways* and she becomes conscious for the first time of her own ‘blindness in seeing eyes’. In her attempt to straddle the ‘three kingdoms’ of work, wifehood and motherhood, she had refused to look into ‘the recesses of her mind’ where – ‘vaguely menacing, like a dream of death that wakes the sweating wretch in midnight terror’ – lurked knowledge of the suffering that she had caused others by her actions (3Ks 221). ‘With horror she repudiated [the things she had done] and shrank from what she saw ... would not acknowledge it, would not see it’ (3Ks 139). It is only when she herself suffers the fear and loneliness of

27 The nameless heroine in Jameson’s second, more nightmarish revisioning of *Mrs Dalloway*, *A Day Off* (1933), is a literal version of this metaphorical ‘frightened old woman’ contemplating social exclusion.

abjection that Laurence's eyes are opened and she sees that in her quest for success as a working woman she has had to 'murder' not only her husband, Dysart, but also their only son, Sandy, who has consequently become 'the unrelenting ghost of a small disappointed boy' (3Ks 257). Furthermore, where in normal circumstances Dysart might be considered old enough to look after himself, in the aftermath of the Great War when 'the meanings and the limits of sexual identity [a]re critically unstable', women are seen to be in a position of greater psychological strength than men (Light, *Forever* 210).²⁸ Thus when Laurence finally takes her sister-in-law's advice to 'look at your husband next time you see him', she sees not simply a misogynist with an old-fashioned view of women, but someone she 'did not know', a shell-shocked, emotionally rebuffed man who – 'pushed to the edge of his strength, with rasped screaming nerves' – is 'hard and cruel in self-defense' (3Ks 179, 232).

As if she had put on a new pair of spectacles, Laurence also begins to see other ghostly figures that inhabit the margins of contemporary society. The latter change is symbolically enacted in a gothic scene in which the ghost of Ola Sampson appears before her. Sampson is an elderly Scandinavian scientist who has been employed to validate Foster Scott's new canning process and has inadvertently discovered that it poses a small risk to human health. When he attempts to draw attention to this fact, he is metaphorically crushed beneath the powerful wheels of the industrial machine. That is to say, distressed and confused by Foster Scott's threats to silence him, he is run over 'in a strange fashion' by a bus that 'break[s] most of his bones, including the bone of his neck' (3Ks 364). In a scene which modifies earlier uses of the looking-glass trope, when Laurence looks in the mirror, she sees reflected there not herself, but this persecuted Other. Looking up from the newspaper in which she has read of Sampson's death, she has a hallucinatory vision of him 'clown-white and wobbling', his head 'lolling brokenly over [the] upper edge' of an old mirror, 'his grotesque face ... drawn up in agonized appeal' (3Ks 364). Sampson's appeal is for

28 Jameson has both Andrew and Dysart describe their feelings of terror at the 'handsome upstanding Amazons' who appear to them to have taken over London's streets while they were away at the Front (3Ks 223, 338–9).

solidarity with all those grotesque and ghostly figures who lead insecure – or ‘wobbly’ – lives on the margins of the social frame. Regretting her previous lack of vigilance, Laurence remarks, ‘What is the use of me? I never even *saw* him when he was talking to us’ (3Ks 364). She also reconsiders her previous, rather simplistic view of mass production, beginning to understand how its social benefits can be hijacked by capitalist manipulation of the market.

As a consequence of her new vision, at the end of the novel Laurence decides to sacrifice herself rather than cause suffering to others. Committing psychological suicide, she voluntarily gives up the job she has fought so hard to save and becomes an ordinary housewife and mother: ‘She held the *other* Laurence down and stifled her protests’ (3Ks 406). At one level, this scenario can be read as Laurence throwing away her victory against ‘the new aesthetic morality’ of modernism by giving in to ‘the Victorian morality which condemned sin’, that is to say, the pre-1910 morality of her northern nonconformist childhood:²⁹ ‘The harsh simplicity of her childhood’s training, confused and overlaid in her adventuring in the modern cockpit, was reasserting its sway. She could not really help herself: it had been there in her blood, nagging at her all the time, and in a crisis it was to the old discipline she answered’ (3Ks 293). Yet as *Three Kingdoms* draws to a close, it is clear that ‘a set of ideas infinitely simpler and less strenuous and confusing’ than those of ‘the modern cockpit’ simply *cannot* provide an answer to the complexity of industrial modernity and although Laurence may comfortingly imagine the ‘stone effigies’ of her Victorian forefathers ‘mov[ing] aside to make room for [her]’ in the ‘small cool [family] vault’, she has too much irreverent vitality for such complete self-immolation (3Ks 249, 293). What is more, she owes something, too, to those Other, more modern, Victorians, ‘the ghosts of all the staunch bitter women who fought for freedom generations before she was born’ (3Ks 345). Thus it is that before the end of the novel, her brother-in-law has already offered her part-time publishing work that she can do at home, promising that ‘afterwards, when the boy is off to school, you might learn the job more thoroughly’ (3Ks 398).

29 For a discussion of these quotations from *The Clash*, see Chapter 3, 97.

Conclusion

One picture that the reader is left with at the end of this novel, therefore, is of the complexities and pragmatic compromises involved in the life of the modern woman juggling the ‘three kingdoms’ of husband, children and work. Although political commitment is only a shadowy theme in the novel, suggested by Laurence’s belated awareness of the need for solidarity with the ghostly victims of the socio-economic system, this picture spoke to a rising generation of socially-minded meritocratic working-women with similarly divided loyalties and commitments for whom Woolf’s ‘world of *purely* aesthetic and intellectual interests’ was not an option (italics added, Holtby, qtd. in Brittain 308). In 1927 Jameson would publish the first volume of a family chronicle, *The Triumph of Time* (1927–31), constructed around the central figure of a proto-modern Victorian woman who, as a northern industrialist and matriarch, successfully combines Jameson’s ‘three kingdoms’. In 1927, too, she would become friends with Winifred Holtby, who successfully combined journalism, novel-writing and political activism, and would write her first letter to Holtby’s friend, Vera Brittain, in response to *her* public expression of views ‘on the subject of combining marriage, motherhood and career’ (Clay 74).

Marion Shaw has argued that although Woolf initially responded to women like Brittain and Holtby as a threat, in the 1930s they came to represent ‘a modern, emancipated type’ embodying ideas, including ‘sexual and professional freedom for women, the responsibility of the writer to society, a refusal of immunity’, which she felt the need to encompass in her own family chronicle, *The Years* (1937) (‘Alien’ 43–4). Given the hurt Woolf later expressed at Jameson’s critical disappointment with that novel, it is likely that Woolf regarded her, too, as belonging to this new constituency.³⁰ Chapter 7 discusses, among other things, those elements in Woolf’s work that Jameson, for her part, reluctantly admired. Before leaving *Three Kingdoms*, however, attention should be drawn to a brief episode which intriguingly suggests that in an ideal world there should be room for different types of

30 For Jameson’s critical comments on *The Years*, see *CJ* 281–2. For Woolf’s hurt at Jameson’s ‘bitter disappointment’, see *Diary V*, 126.

women writers to co-exist harmoniously within the cultural scene and even, perhaps, that Jameson and Woolf may have more in common than either of them is ready to admit. This suggestion occurs when – in the ‘foetid’ atmosphere of the divorce court – Lawrence has a momentary vision of a place beyond this historically determined world where Laurence/Storm and Caroline/Virginia could be friends:

All at once ... Caroline was a little girl, with heavy dark hair falling over her face, and long brown-stockinged legs: she knelt with Laurence beside a narrow stream, peat-brown, with sun-dew and asphodel on a green bed, and her knees pressed out little pools of wet moss. And it was nothing, after all, to smile at, for Laurence too was only a little girl ... They were alone together between the limpid curve of sky spanning the reedy moor. One little girl smiled at the other, and after a while they strode away together, out of sight. (3K_r 333)

Interestingly, Woolf, too, appears to have been aware of the extent to which cultural conflict between ‘New’ and ‘Other’ women was historically determined, for in a little noticed passage from *Mrs Dalloway* she bestows on her heroine the following momentary insight: ‘No doubt with another throw of the dice, had the black been uppermost and not the white, she would have loved Miss Kilman! But not in this world. No.’ (MD 13).

Chapter 7

A 'Voyage Home' from Modernism: Wyndham Lewis, William James and *The Triumph of Time* (1927–1931)

Of no other age was it possible to say, as you can say of this, that human values are less considered than the values created by the machines ... More than other men the artist is aware of this cheapening of human values... If he cannot face it he will run away and write beautifully about the past or about an unreal present. Otherwise he will be driven to wrestle with it, and not merely in order to expose it, but in the hope of changing it.

And this is the true function of the novelist, and the justification for his existence. ... *I believe with all my will* that a novelist is more important than a politician. (italics added, *CJ* 75)

Introduction

In *Journey*, Jameson passes judgment on her first trilogy, *The Triumph of Time*, in her usual self-flagellating fashion, arguing that 'the three novels are like prehistoric animals reconstructed in a museum from clay and a few real bones' (*JN1* 245). The original impulse behind the trilogy was to write a semi-fictional record of Whitby's ship-building industry and its townspeople, the only people Jameson felt she truly knew. It was an impulse that stemmed from Chapman's criticism of her first four novels as 'too emotional' and 'overwritten' and could be viewed as retrogressive with regard to the development of her own literary voice within the context of modernity (*JN1* 225; Jameson, *Love* 18).¹ Indeed, there is some truth in Jameson's later judgment that the first novel in the trilogy, *The Lovely Ship* (1927), 'was even more ... out-of-date than I knew' (*JN1* 245). A Dickensian canvas with a female ship-builder and plutocrat, Mary Hervey (née Hansyke), placed somewhat incongruously at its centre, *The Lovely Ship* looks back towards the baggy monsters of Victorian fiction as well as looking forward to Jameson's later documentary fiction in its

1 For a discussion of Jameson's emotional dependence on Chapman's views versus the internal logic of her own literary development, see Intro., pp.10–11. The descriptor 'overwritten' is used by Nicholas, Chapman's persona in *Love in Winter*. Jameson wrote two other uncharacteristic texts at around this time, *Farewell to Youth* (1928) and *The Decline of Merrie England* (1930), both of which bear the hallmark of Chapman's literary and intellectual tastes.

painstakingly factual account of the shipbuilding industry during a period of extraordinary transformation. As in Victorian novelists such as Charles Dickens, George Eliot and Mrs. Gaskell, there is a counterpoint between the march of history and the moral responsibility of the individual. Like Laurence Storm in *Three Kingdoms*, Mary stands accused of a social 'blindness in seeing eyes' as she refuses to pay attention to the 'mutilated ghosts' of the economically marginalised workers that are the victims of her rise to wealth and power and that are gathering their forces for 'an immense quarrel only just now beginning' (TOT 7, 128). In the remaining two novels of Jameson's trilogy, *The Voyage Home* (1930) and *A Richer Dust* (1931), however, the reader finds herself in an entirely different, intensely contemporary fictional world.

Inter alia a reply to Woolf's first novel, *The Voyage Out* (1915), Jameson's *The Voyage Home* sees her returning to her long-running intertextual dialogue with modernism and engaging in it more extensively and more coherently than ever before. A key to the reinvigoration of her interest in this debate lies in a meeting with Wyndham Lewis that occurred while she was writing *The Lovely Ship* and shortly after her employer, the American publisher Alfred Knopf, had taken over Chapman's ailing publishing business early in 1926. (Knopf then set up an English publishing house which Jameson and Chapman ran together until mid 1928, when they resigned before moving to Whitby in the summer of the following year.) Jameson had recognised Lewis's genius and had written an admiring pastiche of his novel, *Tarr*, in *The Happy Highways*; now she was to meet the notorious author and painter in the flesh. According to her comic description of this meeting in *Journey*, Lewis had reneged on a promise that the American publication of 'his next book' should go to Knopf's and it was Jameson's fruitless task to prevail on him to return it to them.² Although Jameson recalls successfully flattering this 'very intelligent' writer until they walked to the door 'spiritually arm in arm,' she claims – somewhat disingenuously –

2 Jameson also gives a more wickedly funny fictional account of this meeting at the opening of *Love in Winter* (10–11).

not to remember whether the book in question was ‘a novel or literary polemics’ (JN1 236). Possible candidates at this prolific point in Lewis’s literary career include *The Lion and the Fox*, *Time and Western Man*, *The Wild Body* and *The Childermass*.³ Whatever the truth of the matter, Jameson went on to read Lewis’s *Time and Western Man* some time between its English publication in 1927, and the writing of her own 1929 publications, *The Georgian Novel* and ‘The Decline of Fiction’, an experience that was to prove an important watershed in her dialogue with modernism.

Although Jameson by no means approved of Lewis’s flirtation with Fascism or what she described as his ‘Prussian’ temper, she would have greeted many of the values and assumptions behind *Time and Western Man* with a sense of recognition, since these can be traced back to the pre-war tradition of politically-engaged, utopian modernism with which she had been so involved in her university days (*Love* 11). Most crucially, underlying Lewis’s text is a belief in the visionary powers of the artist as a source of political and social transformation that is reminiscent both of Alfred Orage’s early *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism* and of Jameson’s own pre-war thesis on modern European drama.⁴ At the same time, Lewis’s appeal for artistic vision in *Time and Western Man* is informed by a more contemporary horror of modern technological warfare, an emphasis on the concrete and the material, and an urgent concern to prevent a Second World War, all of which would have spoken to Jameson’s own darker post-war perspective.⁵ In addition, here was an iconic representative of literary modernism vociferously articulating (in his own manner)

3 The first American editions of these works are as follows: *The Lion and the Fox* (Harper, 1927); *Time and Western Man* (Harcourt Brace, 1928); *The Wild Body* (Harcourt Brace, 1928); and *The Childermass* (Covici-Friede, 1928).

4 Lewis’s argument in *Paleface: The Philosophy of the ‘Melting-Pot’* (1929) that ‘everything real that has ever happened has come out of a dream’ and that ‘we are the Utopia of the amoeba’ is also surprisingly close to the central argument of Carpenter’s *The Art of Creation* (258).

5 In *TWM* Lewis argues that his advocacy of dictatorship in *The Art of Being Ruled* (1926) was offered at least in part as a ‘humane’ alternative to the gas warfare advocated by J. B. S. Haldane (117). The climax of Jameson’s argument in her anti-war polemic, *No Time* (1933), similarly involves the story of a chemist friend who has given her enthusiastic accounts of his chilling experiments with poison-gas (220–3). It is highly likely that Jameson’s ‘friend’ is Lewis’s Haldane, since the latter was a good friend of Sydney Harland who often went ‘pub crawling’ with him while in England in the spring of 1927 – that is, at around the time Jameson read Lewis’s book (Harland, *Nine* 131).

some of her long-held reservations regarding many of its dominant characteristics, such as its tendency towards solipsism, its move away from referentiality in the quest for individual style and its disengagement from the public, historical and material world. Finally, *Time and Western Man* gave Jameson something new to think about in its insistence, above all, on the value of the rational intellect, an insistence that in 'Paleface or "Love? What Ho? Smelling Strangeness"' (1927) manifested itself first and foremost in a critique of the primitivism of D. H. Lawrence.

It is the argument of this chapter that Lewis's notorious attack on literary modernism acts as a crucial catalyst in Jameson's literary development over the course of the late 1920s and early 1930s. It reinvigorates her early 'new age' belief in the political and social function of literature (with a difference), frees her once and for all from the shadow of certain forms of modernist 'purism', and stimulates her to begin developing a more consistently theorized approach to 'the craft of the novelist' within the context of modernity. Most importantly, it is argued, Lewis's urgent demand for the reinstatement of the 'individual looking, with his intellect, before and after' lies behind Jameson's insistence during the 1930s that writers must take on the job of rescuing England from 'the twilight of reason' so that change might be achieved 'by a directed intelligence' rather than by war (*TWM* 13; *NTP* 188). Where Jameson disagrees with Lewis, namely over his rejection of the power of natural process or 'the triumph of time', it is argued, she turns to her old mentor, William James, drawing for the first time on a wider range of his work, very likely including *Principles of Psychology* (1890) and *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (1912), as well as on the more familiar *Pragmatism* and 'The Will to Believe'. What James offers Jameson, the argument goes, is a radical empiricist approach that faces up to the modern scientific and psychological realities that Lewis sweeps aside, whilst at the same time saving precisely those traditional elements of rationality, referentiality, human agency and community that Lewis requires. Nevertheless, while noting James's renewed influence on her writing, it is important to stress the impact upon Jameson of Lewis's voicing of some of her own long-

held views and the renewed sense of direction and confidence that it gave her. It is a hitherto unnoticed fact that besides being a pragmatic credo for her political writing of the 1930s, the extract from her essay, 'The Craft of the Novelist', that serves as the epigraph to this chapter is almost a *précis* of the central argument of *Time and Western Man*.⁶

This chapter begins by giving a summary of Lewis's attack, in *Time and Western Man*, on what he saw as the debilitating 'time mind' of modern philosophy, science and, in particular, literature, focusing on what he saw as modernism's dismantling of the rational, unified Self, its solipsism, its denial of human agency and consequently its inability to fulfil a proactive role in the much-needed transformation of a society in crisis. The chapter goes on to explore Jameson's major critical writings of 1929, 'The Decline of Fiction' and *The Georgian Novel and Mr. Robinson*, as initial responses to *Time and Western Man*. It reads both pieces as divided in their response to Lewis's text as Jameson agrees wholeheartedly with its utopian desire for a new creative vision that can transform society, whilst simultaneously conceding the value of some of the modernist explorations of the psyche and the scientific materialist representations of Time which it attacks. The third part of this chapter analyses *The Voyage Home* and *A Richer Dust*, that is, those volumes of Jameson's *Triumph of Time* trilogy which were written after the publication of *Time and Western Man*. It argues that in these volumes, too, Jameson critiques Lewis's denial of a scientific materialist reading of Time and his attempt to cling on to the traditional notion of the unified Self, while at the same time seeking, like him, to save the traditional – and politically useful – notions of human agency and community. In order to achieve both these aims, Jameson returns to the work of her old mentor, William James, exploring both his empirical psychology and his pragmatic method – for their bearing on questions of human identity, agency and relationship – and his notion of the 'graft' or 'mosaic' – for its bearing on the question of

6 As Paul Edwards has noted, despite his forceful repudiation of James's philosophy, Lewis's approach was remarkably 'pragmatic' (308). Indeed, he describes James, at one point, as 'philosophically ... the best of company' and admits that he is 'much in sympathy' 'with the spirit of a great deal of his writings' (*TWM* 242).

community. This part concludes by arguing that although Jameson's faith in James's capacity to provide a solution to the literary and political challenges posed both by Lewis's *Time and Western Man* and by modernity in general falters in *A Richer Dust*, it does not ultimately fail, and that both Lewis and, in particular, James were of crucial importance to her as she reinvented herself as a writer moving into the 1930s.

***Time and Western Man* (1927)**

In *Time and Western Man*, Lewis takes a dual approach, attacking contemporary intellectual 'orthodoxies', on the one hand, and what he sees as modernist literature's modish and unquestioning appropriation of those 'orthodoxies', on the other. In what follows, the order of his text is reversed with Lewis's discussion of intellectual 'orthodoxies' being addressed *before* his exploration of modernist literature. Lewis attacks the philosophical and scientific 'orthodoxies' of modernity because he sees them as inducing a dangerous and child-like tendency towards passivity in the face of the mechanisation of society and the encroaching threat of a Second World War. He refers to such contemporary 'orthodoxies' globally as 'time-philosophies', "'time"' being the symbol or shorthand for natural process' (Edwards 309). In particular he attacks Bergson's argument in *Time and Free Will* that a contemporary tendency to spatialise time has led to a failure to apprehend the true nature of existence.⁷ According to Bergson, our states of consciousness can be seen to permeate and melt into one another without precise outlines, so that past and present states form a whole like 'the notes of a tune, melting ... into one another' (Bergson 100). The scientific conceptualisation – or rationalisation – of time as discrete or 'spatialised' moments thus falsifies, for Bergson, both the fluidity and the organic unity of human experience. Very much like Lawrence in his response to Carpenter's 'reconciling' idealism (although he would certainly not have identified himself with Lawrence), Lewis objects to what he sees

7 The recurring collocation of the words 'space' and 'time' stands out both in Jameson's novels and in her literary criticism of this period, offering an 'ungrammatical' Riffaterrian clue to her intertextual dialogue with Lewis's attack on Bergson.

as Bergson's 'solvent' attitude to established notions of subject and object, arguing that Bergsonism plunges its adherents into an unhealthy solipsism (Edwards 307). In Lewis's view, on the one hand, 'our only terra firma in a boiling and shifting world is, after all, our "self". That must cohere' if we are to have any degree of human agency and not just become 'mirror images of alien realities, or as the most helpless and lowest organisms, as worms or sponges' (132). On the other hand, 'this concrete and "material" world' must be salvaged as 'all that is *common* to us' as a society and as that which can thus rescue us from solipsism (177). Confusingly, Lewis also finds fault with the very scientific tradition that Bergson himself opposes, arguing that it, too, dissolves the common-sense boundaries between subject and object, and, in the form of Behaviourism in particular, offers a reductive account of human agency. Finally, he also finds fault with the historicism of Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West*, which sees all individual intellectual and artistic achievements as determined by the *zeitgeist*.

When it comes to contemporary literature, Lewis turns the tables on modernism's attack on literary realism. He accuses modernist writers themselves of a variety of types of 'naturalism' all of which passively reflect the above 'time-philosophies' rather than 'creat[ing] new beauty and ... supply[ing] new material' to inspire society towards revolutionary change (91). The main case study of modernism in Lewis's book is Joyce's *Ulysses*, which he sees as exemplifying, among other things, a psychological form of 'doctrinaire naturalism' consisting of 'telling from the inside' (87, 89). Whilst acknowledging his genius in passing, Lewis criticises Joyce's solipsistic method for producing the very opposite of the detached, rational thinking – 'the individual looking, with his intellect, before and after' – that he himself wishes to encourage (13). Instead, he argues, 'you, the reader' are 'plunged' into 'the duration-flux of Bergson', but 'the author, of course, plunges with you. He takes you inside his head, or, as it were, into a roomy diving-suit, and once down in the middle of the stream you remain the author, naturally, inside whose head you are' (100–1). In addition, Lewis sees Joyce as using 'the mental

world of time ... as a compensating principle' as he retreats in imagination to pre-war Dublin in the face of a harsh post-war reality (81). The only difference between Joyce and Proust in this respect, according to Lewis, is that whereas Proust seeks to recapture the past, Joyce has 'never left it' (91).

Lewis also identifies a 'scientific' variety of 'naturalism' that 'deal[s] with things from the outside', commenting that he prefers the 'hardness' of effect of this variety to the 'softness, flabbiness and vagueness' of the 'bergsonian fluidity' of *Ulysses* (101). He does not stop to give any specific examples of this second variety, however, moving on swiftly perhaps because it is a reminder of his own pre-war 'classical' modernist alliance with Pound and Hulme, an alliance he was now anxious to repudiate. A third, in-between form of modernist 'naturalism' that Lewis discusses in 'Paleface or "Love? What Ho! Smelling Strangeness"' is also relevant to the discussion that follows.⁸ This is the 'naturalism' of those whom Lewis calls the 'physical romantics', Sherwood Anderson, D. H. Lawrence and, to a lesser extent, Ernest Hemingway (*Paleface* 151). This primitivist form of 'naturalism' is in-between in the sense that it is concerned with the life of the body as opposed to the life of the mind, but – unlike the clinical observation of the Behaviourist – its observation of that life is suffused with a subjective vitalism (*Paleface* 103). Finally, in *Time and Western Man* Lewis criticises what he sees as a Bergsonian 'attack' by some modernist writers upon 'the logical architecture of words', singling out the '*faux-naïf*' Gertrude Stein as the arch-offender in this respect (111).

Responding to Lewis in 'The Decline of Fiction' (1929) and *The Georgian Novel and Mr. Robinson* (1929).

Jameson's critical writings of 1929 find her steering a path between what she, like Lewis, terms contemporary forms of 'naturalism' and Lewis's new notion of a 'revolutionary'

8 This text was published in *The Enemy* No. 2 in 1927 and was republished as Part II of *Paleface: The Philosophy of the 'Melting-Pot'* in 1929. Internal evidence, including pastiches of the primitive style of two of its main literary targets, Lawrence and Hemingway, suggests that Jameson may also have read it by the time she wrote *The Voyage Home* and *A Richer Dust*.

literary traditionalism. She acknowledges the value of modernism's psychological mimesis and its scientific materialist approach to 'Time, on the one hand, and of Lewis's recuperation of rational analysis, human agency, imagined community and the political function of literature, on the other. In 'The Decline of Fiction', Jameson writes back to *Time and Western Man*, offering a qualified defence of her own semi-autobiographical type of 'naturalism' and of the various subjective styles of her contemporaries. Beginning with a definition of 'fiction' as 'the art of working in imagined material with imaginary characters', Jameson agrees with Lewis's view that the contemporary novel has become less than 'fiction', abandoning the visionary imagination in favour of a compulsion to 'tell the truth' in a passive or naturalistic sense (*CJ* 26). Like Lewis, Jameson discusses both internal and external versions of naturalism. On the one hand, she argues that the contemporary novelist writes of 'the only living creature about whom he knows even part of the truth', namely 'himself', while, on the other, she traces this subjective naturalism back to its roots in the more 'external' approach of 'those austere collectors of human documents', the literary naturalists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (*CJ* 27–8).

Like Lewis, Jameson also sees scientific behaviourism, with its threat to the notion of an independent 'thinking subject', as relevant to the discussion of naturalism (*TWM* 343). Just as Lewis laments that once the 'mind' has been 'precipitate[d] ... into the abyss' by the behaviourists, 'there is *nothing but* the body left to play with' (italics added, *TWM* 327), so Jameson expresses horror at 'a theory which reduces the finest products of the creative brain to a "nothing but"' (*CJ* 30–1). Jameson's examples of contemporary naturalism include two of Lewis's favourite examples, namely D. H. Lawrence and Marcel Proust, in addition to Aldous Huxley, 'of whom it is difficult to avoid the faint suspicion that perhaps he once *knew* a Naturalist' (*CJ* 28). Like Lewis, (and in a manner that harks back to her own earlier adoption of Orage's mystical Nietzschean-socialism in *Modern Drama*), Jameson regards a more visionary type of creativity as alone capable of helping to deliver social and political change. Echoing Lewis's 'assertion of belief in the *finest type of mind*, which lifts the

creative impulse into an absolute region free of Spenglerian “history”, and his argument that ‘creative art is a spell, a *talisman*, an incantation’ (italics added, *TWM* 144, 187), Jameson ends her essay somewhat less confidently with the pious hope that *some* form of supernatural inspiration – ‘who knows what *talisman*’ – will guide ‘the *finest minds*’ of today to ‘stumble upon the hidden door, and, opening it, let out the future’ (italics added, *CJ* 33).

While both her utopian literary ideal and her analysis of the pathological symptoms of contemporary literature are extremely close to Lewis’s, Jameson’s attitude to the novel’s current condition in ‘The Decline of Fiction’ is somewhat different. In *Time and Western Man*, Lewis is so desperate to avert another war that he must dismiss out of hand anything that merely reflects reality as opposed to offering fresh visions of a new society, and thus he puts down to mere modishness modernism’s various creative and innovatory forms of ‘naturalism’ or mimesis. While Jameson, too, sees cause for political concern in the purely reflective nature of contemporary ‘naturalism’ and the concomitant dearth of creative vision, as a pragmatist she also values the contemporary ‘compulsion to “tell the truth”’ as infinitely preferable to the ‘let’s pretend’ of Liberalism’s rhetorical justifications of the Great War (*CJ* 28, 32).

Unlike Lewis’s global condemnation of psychological fiction, Jameson also expresses a preference for a specific kind of representation of consciousness which she sees D. H. Lawrence as exemplifying. Implicitly refuting Lewis’s wholesale critique of Lawrence’s writing, she ascribes to it two of his own key criteria of aesthetic merit, namely spatial awareness and objectivity. Thus, comparing Lawrence with Proust, she argues that the one works ‘of necessity in *space*, the other in *time*’ and that while Proust ‘draw[s] everything into relation with the *subject*, with himself’, Lawrence is ‘drawn towards the *object*, whether the object be a young woman’s yellow stockings, a meadow in June, or the phantasies of his own unconscious’ (italics added, *CJ* 29). In her later essay, ‘The Craft of the Novelist’ (1932), Jameson clarifies this distinction between ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ varieties of psychological ‘naturalism’, using the additional Lewisian criteria of linguistic clarity and

concreteness in arguing that ‘Lawrence is using the most precise and concrete terms to convey deep emotional experiences’, even though ‘there are times when he cannot avoid becoming obscure’ due to the nature of his subject-matter (*CJ* 73). Most significantly, in the same essay she argues forcefully that we cannot afford to abandon psychological analysis because our ability to ‘get the better of the machines’ is specifically dependent on our ability to ‘understand ourselves, and our secret motives and desires’ (*CJ* 76).

Jameson’s more extensive essay, *The Georgian Novel and Mr. Robinson* (1929), is also written in the light of Lewis’s demand for a visionary literature and again it finds contemporary literature wanting.⁹ Although the Lewisian word ‘vision’ is used more than once during this survey, the concept more often transforms itself into a more Jamesian ‘faith’, yet this, too, is consistent with Jameson’s Lewisian intertext, for Lewis’s statement that his book is ‘the assertion of a belief’ contains its own overtones of James’s ‘will to believe’ (*TWM* 144). What Jameson ideally seeks in ‘the Georgian novel’ – and finds wanting – is a very Lewisian faith ‘in the likelihood that man, so apt to imagine means to destroy himself and his works, will yet devise some means to save them’ (*GN* 70). As in ‘The Decline in Fiction’, the absence of creative vision, of ‘some word to live by’, is related to the disillusioning experience of the Great War (*GN* 45). In contrast to the rather forlorn ending of ‘The Decline of Fiction’, however, Jameson concludes *The Georgian Novel* with a more confident assertion of her ‘will to believe’ in a genuinely forward-looking creative literature and one that echoes Lewis’s notion of a ‘revolutionary’ literary traditionalism:

I believe that [the work of the great novelist of the future] will take a form we shall recognise as that which traditionally belongs to the novel. But the spirit will not be traditional. That will be new. (*GN* 74)

9 It is also, of course, a reply to Woolf’s attack on the Edwardian novel in ‘Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown’, (discussed in Chapter 5 as ‘Character in Fiction’), which includes a convincing defence of Bennett’s *The Old Wives’ Tale*. Jameson’s Mr. Robinson functions as a cross between Woolf’s ‘common reader’ and the ‘Plain Man’ of Lewis’s Preface to *Time and Western Man*. There are also responses to E. M. Forster’s *Aspects of the Novel* (1927).

Yet, as with ‘The Decline of Fiction’, Jameson’s argument in *The Georgian Novel* is not entirely consistent. The visionary novelistic world she is seeking, like Lewis’s, is one of ‘the most extreme and logically exacting physical definition’, yet again, she is also attracted to modernist forms of mimesis which illuminate and reflect the fluid chaos of modernity (*TWM* 109). She is decidedly ambivalent, for example, about the manner in which ‘the Georgians have ... riddled the old solid notion of a Character through and through’ (*GN* 35). Taking as an example of such modernist characterization, Ford Maddox Ford’s Christopher Tietjens, she discusses Ford’s interior style in terms that echo Lewis’s complaint that the reader of *Ulysses* remains trapped within the ‘roomy diving-suit’ of Joyce’s head:

We use Tietjens’ mind to think with ... We *bear and feel* with our eyes, as well as see with them, as we read. The effect is amazingly vivid. It is indeed so vivid that Mr. Robinson [Jameson’s common reader] ... profoundly dislikes it ... He was prepared to ... follow ... the thoughts, as well as the adventures, of the man in the book. But not to think them himself. That is going too far. (*GN* 33)

At this point in the argument, however, a curious thing happens: Jameson distances herself (very courteously) from Mr. Robinson (and Wyndham Lewis) and comes out in favour of Ford’s four Tietjens novels – as against, say, Galsworthy’s *The White Monkey* or *The Silver Spoon* – arguing that no other work has so effectively captured ‘the restless and violent spirit’ of the years between 1912 and 1926 ‘when the ground moved under our feet’ (*GN* 34).

On the subject of determinism versus human agency, too, Jameson is ambivalent. In direct opposition to Lewis’s criticism of Spengler’s *zeitgeist*, Jameson admires the ‘spiral’ form of Woolf’s *To the Lighthouse* for revealing the action of ‘Time, who plays the role of dramatic artist in the life of the universe’ (*GN* 50). She bestows particular praise on the ‘Time Passes’ section of the novel, a Bergsonian prose-poem that evokes the gradual dissolution of material objects under the eroding action of Time. Yet she is worried, like Lewis, by the lack of human agency in Woolf’s work – or what Frank Gloversmith has

called its ‘aesthetic intransitivity’ (25) – arguing that during the course of *Mrs. Dalloway*, for example, ‘nothing of the slightest importance has ... been expected ... from [Clarissa]’ (GN 22). By way of contrast, Bennett’s *The Old Wives’ Tale* is praised for its (pragmatic) ‘double drama’ of ‘life dealing with men and women and men and women dealing with life’ (GN 18). Such a drama, it is clear, depends on the analytical clarity of a traditional plot with its tracing of cause and effect, whereas the synchronic world of *Mrs. Dalloway* leads Mr. Robinson to fear that in the novel of the future he will be ‘left ... with something so fluid and nebulous that it will slip through his fingers altogether’ (GN 23). Yet when settling upon an example of contemporary excellence in the art of narration, Jameson chooses not some traditional story of heroic deeds, but the allegorical pragmatism of the passage from C. E. Montague’s *Right Off the Map* referred to in the Introduction to this thesis, which represents the human need for vigilance, flexibility and persistence in the face of the power of nature and the inevitably slow and incremental character of any human progress.

In the end, what Jameson appears to envisage for the novel of the future is a stylistic and philosophical hybridity combining the old with the new: traditional narrative with psychological insight; analysis with mimesis; some degree of human agency with a recognition of the realities of biological determinism. Certainly, when she predicts that ‘a novelist will arise, able to use – in the service of the Story – the new methods of lighting employed by Mrs. Woolf’, Jameson would appear to be thinking about her own plans for her next two novels, *The Voyage Home* and *A Richer Dust*.

Lewis and James in *The Voyage Home* (1930) and *A Richer Dust* (1931).

Although the opening of *The Voyage Home* picks up from where *The Lovely Ship* left off, the reader is immediately aware that she is entering a very different sort of novel and one in which Jameson writes back both to Lewis’s denial of a scientific materialist notion of Time and to his assertion of the rational, unified Self. In *The Lovely Ship*, Jameson set out to create a central character of the type she would later describe in ‘The Novel in

Contemporary Life' (1937), namely a character of 'heroic size', capable of 'remain[ing] [a] m[a]n' – that is, retaining human agency – even whilst becoming 'the vehicle of impersonal forces' (*CJ* 294–5). In the case of *The Lovely Ship*, the 'impersonal forces' are those of the industrial revolution and the heroic character who retains her human agency is the maverick and innovative ship-builder, Mary Hervey, née Hansyke. Mary's story in *The Lovely Ship* is essentially a feminist take on the Victorian self-help paradigm, in which – after escaping from a childhood marriage to a man as old as her father – she inherits her uncle's ship-building firm over the heads of her male cousins by dint of sheer hard work and tenacity and goes on to take the business from sail to steam, from privately owned firm to limited company. Mary's desires are so completely attuned to her age that when her manager, Mempes, cautions her to go slowly, she replies,

'No. Not slowly. Quickly. Soon. Because the world can't wait ... Can't you feel the pressure of change? It beats in my brain sometimes so that I can hardly bear it ... Can't you hear it coming?' (*TOT* 124)

Yet in the second novel of her trilogy, *The Voyage Home*, (written after the publication of *Time and Western Man*), Jameson retrospectively denies Mary's gutsy heroism as she offers an intertextual challenge to Lewis's dismissal of Spengler, reversing his association of the 'time-mind' with childishness in the process: '[Mary] had imagined that the new age was her work: what childishness – it had used her, she had run her easting down before an implacable wind. Bound to what port? The ship knows only that it moves' (*TOT* 408). From this point on in Jameson's trilogy, 'Time' is 'master in this world' (*TOT* 522).

In addition to a more determinist approach to Time, the opening of *The Voyage Home* ushers in an entirely different representation of character from the traditional approach of *The Lovely Ship*. We first enter a world of Woolfian pastiche in which Jameson takes us inside Mary's head as, like Clarissa Dalloway, she goes about her business preparing for a party she is giving that night. Like Woolf's Clarissa, too, the now affluent Mary has leisure to pause 'between the lawn and the great door opening on the terrace' and to observe 'a

leaf on a tree close to her unfold[ing] as she watche[s], slowly, delicately, offering itself to the air' (TOT 360). As Mary 'loiter[s] with ghosts' from her past (TOT 367), Jameson also makes use of Woolf's 'tunneling process' to fill the reader in on what has gone before (Woolf, *Diary* II 272).

The Bergsonian nature of this new novelistic world is made explicit in a scene in which – as she sits in her room, waiting for death – Mary's old governess, Miss Flora, makes the discovery that there are two varieties of time closely resembling Bergson's 'clock time' and 'real duration':

She had made a remarkable discovery about time ... It went on outside her with the old inexorability, but inside, in her body, it was suspended; and the sunny moment in which she had advanced a step or two towards that kind beckoning figure [her mother] turned out to have lasted five hours. (TOT 379–80)

Yet very soon the luminous interiority of this Woolfian world gives way to a more harshly naturalistic representation of the human mind as an unreliable, physically vulnerable machine, that is to say, a representation that recalls the empirical psychology of William James. Indeed *The Voyage Home* almost seems to offer the reader a series of cases histories illustrating James's *Principles of Psychology*. For example, two ageing figures presented early on in *The Voyage Home* – Miss Flora and Mary's superannuated manager, Mempes – illustrate James's observation that although 'in extreme old age ... the superior tenacity of the paths formed in childhood becomes manifest', present 'brain-paths are so transient that in the course of a few minutes of conversation the same question is asked and its answer forgotten half a dozen times' (*Principles* 661). Thus, while Miss Flora can happily spend five hours among her childhood memories, she 'did not want to talk to' the people who came to visit her in her room because 'her thoughts were hardly clear enough' (TOT 379). Similarly, at a Board Meeting the aged Mempes:

found it difficult to keep his mind on things for any length of time. It played fast and loose with him, sliding in front of the thing on which he ought to be concentrating his attention some other from the past – in colours so fresh and vivid that he was taken in and found himself talking, with pleasurable violence, to the empty air. (TOT 429)

Flora also illustrates James's theory of the 'penumbra' or 'fringe' that surrounds any given mental image connecting it to 'relations and objects but dimly perceived' and of the frustrating inaccessibility of many of these memory traces, which, even when we fail to retrieve them, make themselves felt as 'wraith[s] ... making us at moments tingle with the sense of our closeness, and then letting us sink back without the longed-for term' (*Principles* 251). Thus she struggles to remember what has prompted some words she has recently uttered: 'There had been something, some intimation – but she could not: time hovered for a moment, and withdrew like the ragged edges of a dream' (*TOT* 391).

As in William James's *Principles*, it is not just the old who experience these failures of retrieval, although they are, of course, more prone to them. For example, one young man, Mary's cousin Nicholas Roxby, has just such an experience when he tries to recall why he had felt in a particular way as a child:

He strained his eyes and ears: the child came closer, showed him a bright face, and was gone: the moment was gone, leaving its light pressure on his mind, as sunk now and imperceptible as those tracks made on our fields by the feet of Roman legionaries. (*TOT* 418)

The simile of ancient 'tracks' in the above quotation suggests the 'organised neural paths' which James argues are 'the permanent ground' of the tendency to recall any previous experience, whether one succeeds in doing so or not (*Principles* 654), and this sense of inaccessible but present data is also suggested by a description elsewhere in the novel of a memory that is 'impossible to forget or to recapture' (*TOT* 487).

In his *Principles*, James also gives an account of how effective memory contributes to our sense of 'a common self'. The object of such a memory, he argues, is 'suffused with' the same 'warmth and intimacy and immediacy' as our present mental state and thus 'owned by it, and accepted as *belonging together with it*' (italics added, *Principles* 239). However, the process whereby 'the laws of progressive decay and the continual accession of new impressions take away [even a strong memory's] preponderance' leads, for James, to a situation in which 'the same brain may subserve many conscious selves, either alternate or

coexisting' (*Principles* 401, 672). This multiplicity of selves constitutes a threat to the traditional notion of the unified Self that Lewis finds inadmissible in *Time and Western Man*, where he complains: 'the different *selves* rattle against each other like dice in a coffin: for no dice-box would hold all the selves that James provided for any man, once he had done cutting them up' (*TWM* 338). Yet an early episode from *The Voyage Home* illustrates perfectly – by its absence – the role of 'strong memory' in connecting the present to the past self. In this episode, Mary attempts to recall an old lover, Gerry Hardman, from whom she had separated with much anguish six years previously. At first she is pleased to discover that her memory of that anguish has weakened and her heart now 'beat[s] no faster', but relief is soon followed by a sense of disconnection within her self: 'If nothing remained of that experience, what had she? She started to her feet. Nothing – nothing – no touch from which the warmth had not gone – only ... the grave of thought' (*TOT* 402). A later authorial comment makes James's connection between memory and identity even more explicit, while it foregrounds Jameson's intertextual disagreement with Lewis on this issue. To return to the house of our childhood is a mistake, the authorial voice warns:

since we take with us into rooms that remember us only as young and inexperienced, our tired bodies and the ideas and memories for which we have exchanged those others, less substantial but kinder and easier to live with, of our youth ... The I who was happy in these ... rooms is no longer alive, or, even though he may be alive, is as estranged from the person we now are as if the two spoke different languages or had lived in opposite quarters of the world – far wider estranged, since the gulf that divides them is *not space but time*. (italics added, *TOT* 589)

On one level, *The Voyage Home* and *A Richer Dust* taken together constitute a comparative study of various characters' approaches to the fluid materiality of life and the Self, which reworks and suggests a resolution to the dialogue between thought and action that Jameson first staged through the characters of Thurlow and Denarbon in *The Pot Boils*. Firstly, there is Mary whose belief in a unified Self, in human agency, in a concrete external world and in the importance of order closely resembles that of Lewis in *Time and Western Man*. At the opposite extreme is her second husband, Hugh Hervey, who epitomizes the Bergsonian passivity that Lewis anathematizes in the same text. Finally, between these

extremes lie the approaches of their children, Richard, Clara and Sylvia. The intertext that provides the interpretive key to this younger generation is not *Time and Western Man*, but James's *Pragmatism*, and there are also echoes of the passage from C. E. Montague's *Right Off the Map* quoted in Jameson's *The Georgian Novel*.

As she ages during the course of the trilogy, like Lewis himself, Mary becomes 'afraid of losing herself' (*italics added*, *TOT* 493). Conscious that memory is the key to a unified identity, 'if she could, she would have kept ... every memory. Nothing must be lost' (*TOT* 493). In an attempt to arrest the Woolfian flight of time, 'drawing away with it, a resistless torrent, ... all the forms and colours that for her were the significance of life', she gathers around her a 'horde of things', 'folding them away, stowing them in corners, until her room like her mind was a rich storehouse of memories, seized, kept safe' (*TOT* 580, 643). Her situation thus recalls the precariousness of Lewis's own philosophical position when he admits that 'camped ... upon the surface of this nihilism, we regard ourselves as at rest, with our droves of objects ... grouped round us' (*TWM* 443). At the same time, in Lewisian fashion, Mary is not lost in the past but continues to 'stare ahead', and despite being gradually pushed to the margins of history by both social change and her own mortality, she continues to attempt to exert her will on those around her, since 'it went too hardly against the grain to think that she was helpless' (*TOT* 468, 643).

Nevertheless, as Mary lives on into the early twentieth century in *A Richer Dust*, her life-story comes to epitomise the extinction of 'the subject conceived as king of the psychological world', to quote the title of Book II, Part II, Chapter 3 of Lewis's text. In the latter chapter Lewis observes how 'this sad history ran parallel to the libertarian process of the suppression of all visible authority, and the rooting-out of our Western society of all its emblems' (*TWM* 343). Similarly in *A Richer Dust*, the increasingly marginalised Mary is frequently associated with that emblematic authority figure, Queen Victoria, and even while her grandson and heir, Nicholas Roxby junior, finds some comfort in the stability and order she represents, in the highly symbolic year of 1910 he reflects with relief that 'in the

end, though the shadow of her unrelaxing authority fell across him, he had only to step out of it to be in full sun' (*TOT* 692).

The very opposite of the 'denial of volition' that Lewis sees as 'especially characteristic of our period', Mary resists but must finally face the slow defeat of her enormous will-power by the impersonal forces of physical, social and political change (*TMW* 296). Thus when the Great War breaks out and Nicholas decides to join up, she experiences a 'feeling of impotence before events she could not control' that 'irk[s] her beyond bearing' and by the time the casualty lists of the Battle of the Somme have been published, she is said to have 'lost some certainty' (*TWM* 897, 950). 'Defeat, final and irretrievable' 'surprise[s] her with another voice' than the one she has been expecting, however, as, having survived the war, Nicholas refuses to fulfil her plans for him to take over Garton's (*TOT* 1015, 1020). Finally, the trilogy ends with a detailed account of the peaceful, but nonetheless irrevocable, fragmentation of the unified Self Mary has so determinedly constructed, as 'the lines of communication between mind and body [are] cut or broken down' and – her retrieval of the present going first – she reconnects with memories of her childhood self before 'slipping back ... to more remote levels of thought; on which and only on which she lived for the length of time, measured in heart-beats, it took her to reach the lowest level of all' (*TOT* 1170, 1177).

At the end of *A Richer Dust*, Jameson remains ambivalent about her Victorian heroine. There is comic absurdity and even grotesqueness in Mary's fight to retain the illusion of her own autonomy as she becomes more manically active – writing letters, attending meetings, going to the theatre – the closer death approaches, 'as if by mere spinning of threads between herself and other people she could stiffen her hold on life' (*TOT* 1164).¹⁰ Yet there is also something to admire in the courage with which she continues to exert her will against time, sitting 'stiffly upright ... her mouth a stretched line ... her hands gripping the

10 Jameson may also be writing back here to the mysticism underlying *Mrs. Dalloway*, with its suggestion that 'the thread[s] of attachment' connecting people outlast their deaths (102).

sides of her chair so that the knuckles stood out' and in the success with which she projects the illusion of the supremacy of her will, so that – when she finally succumbs to death – Nicholas is furious with the doctor for suggesting she has died of natural causes, having 'a profound and unshakeable conviction that no force could have vanquished [her] if her own will had not abandoned the position' (*TOT* 1010, 1171). Furthermore, for various pragmatic or private sentimental reasons, despite believing in a Tory politics of the survival of the fittest, Mary carries out a number of schemes that have solid social benefits. For instance, during the war she insists that workers who have 'signed up' continue to be paid and that all workers share in the company's war profits, while after the war she sets up an organisation for the rehabilitation of soldiers.

Yet if Jameson makes some concessions to Lewis's position on the value of the human will and the integrated Self in her characterisation of Mary, she also goes against a number of his other arguments. Firstly, she suggests that a tenacious protection of the integrated Self is incompatible with true recognition of the Other. Thus, Mary alienates those she loves by treating them as extensions of her own ego, arranging their lives with undeniable generosity but with an 'utter lack of respect', while industrial relations are hampered by the 'mistrust and resentment' that are bred between herself and the Unions by the fact that 'neither really heard the other' (*TOT* 559, 672). Secondly, Jameson shows how Mary's Lewisian inability 'to think except in concrete images' prevents joined up thinking, inhibiting the very cultural criticism that Lewis desires (*TOT* 959). Thus, 'the pattern of England ... missed her eye altogether' and 'so did the connection ... between the tremendous years when her steamships were crowding [hand-built clippers] off the seas and the slack sprawling body of [her cousin] young Robert Ling, shot through the head' and 'lying against the side of the trench' (*TOT* 959). Finally, Mary illustrates the problems of Lewis's surface approach to the human personality as 'like a bird skimming over the surface of a stream, her memory touche[s] only the tips of the waves' (*TOT* 703–4). Keeping the depths of her unconscious mind 'sealed' like the box in which she has hoarded

a secret store of silk underwear since her early days of poverty, Mary ‘knew no more what she had sought than what she had got’ (*TOT* 1031), and thus she provides a negative illustration of Jameson’s argument that it is only ‘when we understand ourselves, and our secret motives and desires, [that] we can ... get the better of the machines’ (*CJ* 76). Mary may have done good works in the course of her life, but in her lack of insight into both Self and Other, she has also blindly contributed to social inequality and class-conflict at home and to the fierce economic competition abroad that was to lead to two world wars.

In extreme contrast to Mary’s Lewisian philosophy, her second husband, Hugh Hervey, epitomises Lewis’s ‘time-mind’ itself. A rentier and amateur academic, who in his youth frequented a Pre-Raphaelite socialist colony in Bloomsbury that looked forward eagerly to ‘an event they called alternatively the Revolution or ‘The Dawn’ (*TOT* 153), Hugh *is* Lewis’s ‘revolutionary simpleton’ (*TWM* 1). Like Lewis’s Ruskinian ‘romantic’, his ‘radicalism’ consists in wishing to turn back the industrial clock (*TWM* 5), so that England may be ‘again a nation of craftsmen’ (*TOT* 816). Thus Mary observes, ‘You’re a Tory, yourself, really. The other’s only a dream you had. Oh, a charming dream, but a dream ...’ (*TOT* 155). Like Lewis’s ‘revolutionary simpleton’, too, Hugh is associated with the fluidity of Bergsonian *durée*, and nowhere more so than in a Woolfian scene in which he first observes ‘the tide’ of ‘eighties’ traffic ‘flow[ing] round the great houses and the lovely quiet squares between Bond Street and the Park’ before ‘plung[ing] into a current’ that takes him to the opera, where he ‘let[s] the tide of reminiscence flow gently over him’ (*TOT* 517–8). He exemplifies, too, Lewis’s dictum that ‘the more absolute ... disbelief [in the reality of life] is, as a formulated doctrine, the more the *sensation* of life ... will assume a unique importance’ (*TWM* 8), as the following quotation suggests:

Nothing, he thought, could be more grotesque than to try to give importance to any man’s life, a moment dropped between a brief past and an unimaginable future. Only trivial things have any importance, the smell of earth after rain, a leaf unfolding, a young voice heard clearly but the words not heard, sunlight coming through the leaves on to the tables of a café. (*TOT* 644–5)

Finally, illustrating Lewis's association of the 'time-mind' with a lack of human agency, although he might be more sensitive than Mary to the fact that 'the mechanism of industry' is 'wasteful and bloody' and might be kinder to individuals, 'he refuse[s] to take on himself any responsibility', increasingly driven by a 'profound instinct – to turn his back on life' (*TOT* 375, 475).

As mentioned earlier, the key intertext behind Jameson's representation of the approach of each member of the younger generation to the flux of existence is James's *Pragmatism*. In each case, that approach is represented allegorically in a single key episode involving a literal and/or metaphorical river. In contrast to the opposing extremes of the Lewisian Mary, who remains on the surface of the stream, and the romantic-modernist Hugh, who is entirely immersed in the flux, in *Pragmatism* James recommends a process of alternately 'plunging forward into the river of experience' and surfacing to take in the 'oxygen' of ideas, a process that seems better adapted to the exigencies of modernity (49). (It is a process that is also suggested in Jameson's favourite allegorical passage from Montague's *Right Off the Map*, in which the soldiers of the Rian Army 'lark and splash' in the stream as they 'cross and recross' between the dry land on one side and that on the other (*GN* 28–9).) This pragmatic method allows us both to derive our ideas *from* our experience and to return *to* experience for data with which to verify them. Furthermore, James recommends that we keep our ideas realistic, so that when we take them back into the stream of experience, we do so 'with a cool head' (57). The older two of Mary's children, Richard and Clara, offer two alternative examples of how this pragmatic method might contribute towards greater control over our own lives and more successful relationships with others. They also, incidentally, suggest a more cautious and rational approach than D. H. Lawrence to the challenge of opening up to the Other.

Richard, who is desperately in love with his beautiful but selfish cousin, Cynthia Roxby, illustrates not only James's notion of the need to verify our ideas but also his notion of a semi-conscious 'penumbra' surrounding our thoughts: 'He was scarcely aware that he

mistrusted [Cynthia]. He held himself ... in a suspense of thought and feeling, waiting for some moment, some word – he hardly knew what – which would launch him into the felicity of surrender’ (*TOT* 442). Unfortunately for Richard, the verifying moment or word never comes. Moreover, when Cynthia seeks to bind him to her by having sex with him, although he ‘plunge[s] into [the] swiftly running stream’ of this experience so that ‘the water close[s] over his head’, Richard exemplifies something like James’s notion of keeping a ‘cool head’, since ‘he could lift his eyes against [the stream]’ and ‘feel the coolness of his limbs’ (*TOT* 465). His judgment thus remaining unimpaired, when Cynthia subsequently gives irrevocable evidence of her egotism, he is able to attend to that evidence and to act on what he has learned by bringing their relationship to a close (and beginning a new life in South America).

Clara’s application of the pragmatic method has more felicitous results. She is in love with Cynthia’s brother, Nicholas, who thinks that he is in love with her more beautiful and less gauche sister, Sylvia. When Clara agrees to go boating with Nicholas to console him for her sister’s neglect, she is initially cautious, refusing to let him kiss her, because he is not emotionally committed to her. When she follows him off the boat onto the river-bank, however, her unconscious mind leads her to step ‘accidentally’ into the water where she sinks ‘over her shoulders’ – as in her brother’s case, her eyes remain unaffected (*TOT* 499). This symbolic immersion in the flux of experience gives her the verifying data she needs, when Nicholas’s ‘kind serious young face’ persuades her that – unlike his sister, Cynthia – he can be trusted emotionally (*TOT* 501). At this point, as a Jamesian pragmatist ‘willing to live on a scheme of uncertified possibilities which [s]he trusts’, Clara risks letting Nicholas kiss her, and romance and, in time, a successful marriage ensue (*Pragmatism* 115).

Finally the beautiful and spoilt Sylvia offers a pragmatic example of the dangers of false beliefs when she elopes with the cad, Rupert Ling, of whose true character she remains willfully ignorant. Sylvia’s unrealistic ideas of romantic adventure and her previous lack of immersion in experience are symbolized by the surface of the Thames shining in the

morning sunlight, prompting her ‘childish’ question – ‘Why do I like rivers so much?’ – and her delight when Ling promises to show her ‘real mystery rivers’ (TOT 531). Unbeknown to Sylvia, Ling’s marriage-plans have been side-tracked by news of a gold-rush in South Africa and her romantic ideas are tested by reality when he asks her to sail with him unmarried to Dieppe. Having placed her reputation in Ling’s hands, Sylvia ‘force[s] herself to think well of him’ against mounting evidence to the contrary (TOT 531). However, when he defers their marriage a second time on their arrival at Dieppe and informs her that their real destination is Cape Town, ‘the importance ... of having true beliefs about matters of fact’ and the fact that ‘we live in a world of realities that can be ... infinitely harmful’ – to use James’s words – comes home to her (*Pragmatism* 78).

For James, the unconscious is as much of a reality as the external world and our awareness of the ‘penumbra’ surrounding our thought is what allows us a small but crucial margin of human agency. What happens next, in Sylvia’s case, illustrates the dangers attendant upon the lack of such awareness. Deserted by Ling in a foreign port, she abandons herself to a self-destructive impulse to marry on the rebound the ill-educated and dishonest Captain Russell whom she happens to encounter there. Jameson describes this impulse in Jamesian terms, emphasizing Sylvia’s lack of practice in attending to her own thoughts and the consequent manner in which the flux of the unconscious acts upon her rather than *vice versa*:

She knew, *in some part of her mind too far away to grasp*, that she ought to do something to save herself ..., anything except abandon herself to the impulse that, rising from her own deep like one of those huge waves that lift themselves from the depths of a tranquil sea and bear down upon some unlucky ship, submerged her and thrust her forward ... to destroy herself. (italics added, TOT 548)

Jameson explores the theme of authentic relationship between the Self and the Other further in her depiction of the voyage that occurs at the end of the second novel in her trilogy, giving it its name. Wishing to keep her departing son with her for as long as possible, Mary, together with her husband Hugh, accompanies Richard on his journey to

South America. In Jameson's characteristic fashion, this voyage (out and home) is a highly symbolic and intertextual one, with echoes not only of Woolf's *The Voyage Out* but also (more generally) of Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. It begins, like the latter novels, as a voyage away from the protective structures of Western convention to a place where 'even an English woman is subject to the laws of nature' (TOT 612). In a reversal of Woolf's novel, however, it is the English man, Hugh, and not the English woman, who catches fever on arriving in South America and, again in a reversal of *The Voyage Out*, the English patient survives. In writing back to Woolf thus, Jameson validates the empirical possibility of connection between Self and Other – a validation developed not only from her responses to Lewis and James, but also from her earlier response to Lawrence – whilst she acknowledges the fluid nature of reality, including that of ourselves.

In the South American resort which is the destination of *The Voyage Out*, Woolf's idealist heroine, Rachel Vinrace, seeks to establish a more mystically complete kind of relationship with her fiancé, Terence Hewett, than would be possible within the constraints of English Edwardian society. However, the sheer difficulty of this task appears somehow to precipitate her descent into a solipsistic world of fever and eventual death. In contrast, although, like Rachel, Hugh catches a fever and 'descend[s] ... to an immense depth, between walls of darkness', he is not, like her, trapped in this nightmare of solipsism (TOT 621).¹¹ Rather, he is brought back to health – and his marital relationship with Mary renewed – by the empirical evidence of simple or 'homely' human kindness which the environment of the sickroom provides. The Jamesian empiricism informing Jameson's handling of human relationships in this episode is suggested in the following description of the fragile bond surviving between Mary and Hugh as a couple when the latter is very ill. This description also writes back to the modernist subjectivism of Marlow's view, in *Heart of Darkness*, that 'we live, as we dream, alone' (35):

11 In her fever, Rachel has a hallucination of being bricked in, in a tunnel under the Thames (Woolf, *Voyage* 313).

She saw that his eyes were fixed on her in the cold stare of a man neither asleep nor awake, in that moment between the two when the sleeping self has vanished and the other is not yet reunited with him. Then she saw re-enter them the flicker of recognition, the only thing except the bodily touch and keener than it, which assures each of us that we are not alone in the world, that we exist in minds outside our own. (TOT 615)

The possibility of connection between Self and Other that the above episode suggests is applied to the larger political problem of community-formation through the figure of Mrs. James, the wife of the ship's captain, who accompanies Mary and Hugh on their voyage out and who is a version of William James in female form. In the fictional guise of Mrs. James, Jameson foregrounds precisely that link between Self and 'Not-Self' which Lewis had demanded in *Time and Western Man*, but in a form which writes back not only to the modernist solipsism he criticizes, but also to his own more worrying fascist tendencies as expressed in *The Art of Being Ruled* (1926).¹² As Paul Edwards has observed, 'the heart of Lewis's actual consideration of political theory in *The Art of Being Ruled* is the series of chapters contrasting Proudhon and Rousseau' and in this series of chapters, he rejects Proudhon's federalist model for Rousseau's centralist one (301). (He then goes on to equate the centralist models of communism and fascism with one another and to argue that the latter is more suited to European culture.) David Kadlec, on the other hand, has shown the influence of Proudhon's federalism on William James's development of the notion of a 'pluralistic world' which is 'more like a federal republic than like an empire or a kingdom' (James, qtd. in Kadlec, 27). Kadlec goes on to observe, however, that James's 'graft-theory' – that is, the notion of an 'additive' entity which harmoniously combines with the original living organism but which is not determined by it before hand – 'differs from Proudhon's [utopian] notion of an "economic organism" in that it does not propose to recover a "natural" unity between autonomy and voluntary association', but is always 'in process of achievement' (29).

Other images used by James to describe the above notion of the 'graft' are the 'patchwork' and the 'mosaic' and, in characteristic fashion, Jameson has her Mrs. James

12 For Lewis's insistence on the importance of 'the impulse towards the Not-Self', see *TWM* 180.

produce both of these. Afloat on the sea of experience, as she accompanies her husband from port to port, she links together into one loose-knit community-in-process all the various agents' wives in exile, far from home, bringing with her as presents prized items such as English tea and cordials from her brass-bound medicine chest. This Jamesian community-in-process is symbolized not only by the 'mosaic of photographs of her friends' that adorn her cabin walls, but also by the Household Book which contains the recipes that she and her exiled friends exchange in a Proudronesque system of barter; and by the quilts that she sews from 'a box of pieces, fragments of silk of every colour' while at sea, to give to the agent's wife on arrival at each new port (*TOT* 594).

A further clue that Jameson is here writing back to Lewis's political centralism is present in the role that language takes in Mrs. James's mosaic community. Before discussing the specific nature of that role, however, it is important to note that in this final section of the novel Jameson represents a pragmatic view of language that is shared by both James and Lewis, that is, a belief in the need for a common system of reference as essential to communal life. In *Time and Western Man*, Lewis refers to this system as:

This pact with other people, whereby a system of *things* – of words, of images, of emotions – long ago, it was agreed, should be held *in common* and held as fact. (181)

In *Pragmatism*, James warns, on the other hand, that although we rely largely on inherited knowledge and social custom in our language use and thus dispense with 'face-to-face verifications' of the correspondence between language and reality in most instances, we do need periodic confirmation that our ideas are true, for without them 'the fabric of truth collapses like a financial system with no cash-basis whatever', leading to 'excentricity and isolation' (80, 83). In *The Voyage Home* an illustration of both Lewis and James's arguments is given in the case of Elsie Sanderson, the sick, isolated and eccentric daughter of the agent's wife in Vera Cruz. Elsie is ailing, it is suggested, because she and her mother lack a shared system of reference. Having been born and raised in South America, Elsie finds that phrases that her mother uses – such as 'as weak as a little tommy tit' – have no basis in her

experience and since she is unable to believe her mother on the subject of native English birds, she tends not to believe her on other subjects either with the consequence that communication between them breaks down (*TOT* 599).

The repeatedly emphasized fact that Mrs. James in all her travels ‘has never been able to learn any tongue but her own’ and is profoundly suspicious of foreigners, would seem to suggest that Jameson’s view of the possibilities of political and social unity is closer to James’s than to that of Lewis. Whereas in *Paleface* Lewis advocates the notion of a centralized European – and eventually international – ‘melting pot’ in which the ‘great difficulty’ of language difference would be solved by everyone speaking Volapuc (280), in *Pragmatism*, James argues that although quite large-scale local communities might successfully be created, ‘appearances conflict with’ the view that total political and social unity ‘might conceivably be reached’ (52, 54). Finally, the idea that Jameson is writing back to Lewis’s unappealing anti-democratic political theories at this point in *The Voyage Home* would explain the ‘ungrammatical’ Riffaterrian detail of the homosexuality of the doctor who, together with Mary, devotedly nurses Hugh back to life, yet who must remain forever in exile given the punitive European laws against homosexuality. Both physically massive and ‘gentleness itself’, Jameson’s doctor deconstructs Lewis’s obsessive categorization of homosexuals as either feminine and ‘soft’ – and therefore damned together with women and children – or masculine and ‘hard’ – and, therefore, saved (*TOT* 618).¹³

In *A Richer Dust*, even James appears to fail Jameson. Despite the novel’s optimistic title and the fact that it begins before the Great War (in the symbolic year of 1910), its modernity takes on an entirely post-war cast, characterized intertextually by the deadness of T. S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land* (1922) and what for Jameson was the hollowness of Ernest Hemingway’s surface style.¹⁴ Feeling increasingly ill-at-ease in a Europe threatened by

13 For Lewis on homosexuality, see *Art*, 289–313.

14 In a letter to Bonamy Dobrée dated 25 Nov. 1929, Jameson wrote that ‘between them, Hemingway and Andrewes have so muddled my small wits that I am now writing a novel in words of one syllable and leaving everything out.’ For an example of a Hemingway pastiche relating to the third generation in *TOT*, see 695–702.

America's economic might and the rise of the Jewish financier, the dying Hugh rides tiredly over a spring landscape, in which 'the sap d[oes] not run and there [i]s none of that cruel importunity of fresh life, stirring the dull earth and breeding desire and memory in the mind', and he becomes – like Eliot's 'Gerontion' – 'an old man living in a borrowed house' 'with cracked windows' and shutters that need mending (TOT 786, 799, 814). Finally, following a feverish train journey in which he has a kaleidoscopic series of hallucinations reminiscent of the fragmentary form and content of *The Waste Land*, he dies because 'the profound sadness which clutched the roots of his mind ... ha[s] destroyed in him finally the impulse of life itself' (TOT 820).

Although Nicholas, Mary's grandson and representative of the post-war generation, dismisses Eliot's poetry as 'too sad', 'out of apathy and boredom' he and his fellows 'refrain from protest' at the direction modernity is taking and so do not seem to offer much hope either (TOT 1049, 1117). As if anticipating the theories of a certain visiting Austrian professor from Vienna (Freud) who later informs her that there is 'a death principle at work in Europe' (TOT 1157), Mary has an alarming vision of her grandchildren 'let[ting] themselves drift with the strong current':

The force of the current was not constant ... but always the movement, sucking and resistless, was towards – toward what, then? A horrible uncertainty gripped her limbs. She tried to call, to warn the drifting figures. (TOT 1117)¹⁵

That the post-war generation's loss of a sense of direction is Jameson's own is suggested by what is best described as an ironic intertextual sketch in which William James reappears in the guise of a second doctor within the story, the benign charlatan, Dr. James, who visits the dying Hugh. In a wryly comic exchange, Mary points out the platitudinous nature of Dr. James's common sense medical advice, observing 'I had thought of that myself. Is that the best you can do?' (TOT 818). As Hugh lies on his deathbed (and Europe with him), Dr. James's cheery optimism and his repeated claim that 'there is no cause for

15 This passage contains obvious echoes of the climax of George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss*.

alarm' puts Mary (and Jameson) beyond patience and he is summarily dismissed (*TOT* 818). Yet at the end of *A Richer Dust*, there are two small signs of the more politically constructive mood to come in Jameson's work. Firstly, Mary's signalled request that Nicholas lay Mrs. James's Household Book beside her as she lies dying at the end of the novel suggests that Jameson herself may not have dismissed William James's pragmatism after all. Secondly, there is the very belated arrival on the scene of Hervey Russell, educated daughter of Mary's estranged – and uneducated – daughter, Sylvia. It is Hervey's 'imagination, memory and experience' that will be 'the focus and mediator of the spectacle' of 'the alienated city that is [post-war] London' in Jameson's next trilogy, *Mirror in Darkness* (Birkett, 'Spectacle' 31), and there is already a grain of promise in the energy with which – on learning of her grandmother's death – she declares, 'Well *I'm* alive' (*TOT* 1173).

Conclusion

In *No Time*, Jameson recalls how 'writing the third [and final novel of her first trilogy] – [she] realized suddenly that [she] had lost all interest and belief in writing' (144). This statement can be collated with another account of a 'first moment of dryness as a writer in May 1930, in a copse in Whitby' with which Jennifer Birkett begins her article, 'Beginning Again: Storm Jameson's Debt to France' (4).¹⁶ Yet if Birkett is right that it was from here that Jameson 'began again' as a writer looking for inspiration to the French literary tradition, she is surely wrong in arguing that 'the English modernist novel had no impact on Jameson' ('Beginning' 14). As for James, so for Jameson, 'beginning again' involved no modernist rupture, but 'graft[ing]' new ideas 'upon the ancient stock with the minimum of disturbance to the latter' and thus she took into the next phase of her writing a rich treasure-trove of intellectual insights and creative ideas derived from her decade-long dialogue with English modernism (*Pragmatism* 24).¹⁷

16 The account Birkett refers to is from 'Introduction and Apology for my Life' in *Civil Journey*.

17 See, for example, the *Civil Journey* essay, 'Culture and Environment' (1933), in which Jameson argues that in the context of modernity, 'it becomes all the more vitally necessary for the writer ... to maintain touch with what is valuable in the past at the same time that he helps to create the future' (118).

As the analysis in this chapter suggests, both Jameson's critical writing of 1929 and the second and third volumes of *The Triumph of Time* provide evidence of crucial lessons learned from English modernism, from Lewis and from James. Despite her momentary loss of faith or nerve, Lewis had strengthened Jameson's belief in the political value of the novel and the need for social responsibility on the part of the novelist. In addition, he had also made a convincing case for the social value of a common language that has its roots in historical experience, as against the modernist quest for a more personal, dehistoricised style. Finally, he had confirmed her unease at Lawrence's irrational primitivism (and, before that, at her own early anarchism) whilst, at the same time, reiterating the reaction against a more passive, historically detached, modernist solipsism that had drawn Jameson to Lawrence in the first place. Henceforth in her writing, as epitomized by her 1934 essay, 'The Twilight of Reason', she would devote herself to the fight against 'a spread of disrespect for reason', that, like Lewis, she would trace back to 'the philosophy of Bergson' and 'the novels of D. H. Lawrence', among other phenomena, and forwards to Fascism and a Second World War (*CJ* 194).

From James's Pragmatist philosophy and empirical psychology, besides a vital 'will to believe' that gave her a *raison d'être* as a writer, Jameson had learnt how to combine Lewis's 'revolutionary' traditionalism with modernist perspectives that she was loth simply to abandon. Firstly, rather than simply brushing aside the modernist flux with Lewis, James offered her a method both for empirical observation of the subjective mind, and, conversely, for verifying abstract ideas against the flux of our experience, as a basis for small but crucial modifications of reality. Secondly, James's philosophy had also given her what would prove to be a deeply influential political model of 'mosaic' community that was a compromise between the 'romantic' and the 'classical' modernist polarities that she had first encountered before the war and had been wrestling with ever since. Thirdly, James had not only confirmed Jameson's sense of the social and political value of a common language, but also, through his concern with the credit-worthiness of shared language, he

had reawakened her early linguistic concern with ‘the direct treatment of the thing’. The older Jameson’s more politically mature version of this concern would inform her articulation of the political realities behind the slogans that came to dominate public debate in the 1930s and her resistance of the process whereby ‘words had ... been emptied of their meaning’ (JN1 302).

Further evidence both of James’s influence on Jameson’s writing and of the continuity within her literary approach can be found in the major essay, ‘The Craft of Fiction’ (1932) that she went on to write not long after she had completed *A Richer Dust*. In spite of her supposed loss of direction, this essay sums up what Jameson has learnt during the previous decade and uses it as a spring-board for her writing in the 1930s. Among other things, it constructs a Jamesian model of communication between writer and reader, in which the words of a novel are ‘the visible extension of [its author’s] nervous system’, and these words ‘play’, in turn, on the reader’s ‘nerves’ as on ‘the strings of [a] fiddle’ – although, the writer ‘has to take his chance that certain words ... mean to us what they mean to him’ (CJ 57–8, 61). According to this model, a good novelist (like a good pragmatist) is distinguished by an unusually high level of awareness of reality which it is her job to communicate to her readers, so that a good novel ‘mak[es] you [the reader] *more sensitive in your relations with your fellows and more aware of what is going on within and without you*’ (italics added, CJ 60–1). Despite her momentary loss of the ‘will to believe’, Jameson’s ultimate confidence in the quietly accretive power of this communicative process is beautifully conveyed in her comparison of the novel to ‘a flower which creeps close to the ground, yet spreads everywhere. It comes home with us all’ (CJ 57).

Conclusion

This thesis has not taken a single theoretical approach, but has adopted a mixed methodology, combining biography, cultural history and, first and foremost, intellectual biography, as most appropriate to the hybrid, boundary-crossing nature of Jameson's own writing. Taking into account the quantity of material already available both in Jameson's own autobiographies and in Jennifer Birkett's recently published biography, *Margaret Storm Jameson: A Life* (2009), conventional biography has generally been limited to the brief sketches which are to be found at the openings of Chapters 3–7. These explain the key factual details from Jameson's personal life which are fictionalised in the work under consideration and suggest something of the personal circumstances in which that work was written. More extended biographical material has also been included in Chapter 1 with the aim of highlighting two key formative experiences from Jameson's early years: her profound experience of social (and hence psychological) division as a child and the contrasting experience of freedom and belonging that was hers during a relatively brief period of radicalism as a student in Leeds and London just before the Great War.¹ It was as she gradually came down to earth from the latter exhilarating experience that Jameson began to reflect critically on her early radicalism and on the modernist cultural scene in general with the 'double vision' of the outsider-insider (Bhabha 8).

As a second strand within its mixed methodology, this thesis has included cultural history. Originating in the study of high art forms, the discipline of cultural history has more recently shifted its focus to the study of culture interpreted more broadly as 'the attitudes and values of a given society and their expression or embodiment in collective representations ... or practices' (Burke 190). This thesis, however, shares the view of the anthropologist James Clifford, and of a number of recent cultural historians, that culture is not a 'bounded, coherent collectivity' but is rather a 'disputed, torn ... and intertextual'

¹ Chapter 1 was written before Birkett's biography was published. It covers some of the same ground, but also includes new material.

phenomenon (Clifford 232). In order to better understand the specific nature of Jameson's cultural perspective as a female meritocrat from the provincial north and of her encounter with a variety of English metropolitan modernisms, this thesis has therefore focused on a range of sub-cultures, as well as micro-cultures, with which she was involved, and on the various ways in which these groups differentiated themselves from, and/or contested the values and practices of, more hegemonic cultural groupings. Key examples of this approach are the short studies of the pre-war sub-cultures of the Leeds Arts Club and radical elements within the new University of Leeds in Chapter 1; the micro-culture of the King's College Eikonoklasts in the same chapter; and the sub-culture of meritocratic 'middlebrow' writers who frequented Naomi Royde-Smith's Thursdays at the beginning of Chapter 5. Inspirational models for this form of cultural history have included, 'The Discovery of Puritanism, 1820–1914', Raphael Samuel's study of the various ways in which a cultural identification with Puritanism was 'taken up ... by those who were at some sort of odds with society' between 1820 and 1914 (*Island* 293); Tom Steele's *Alfred Orage and the Leeds Arts Club*, a study of the values and practices of the provincial avant-garde of the Leeds Arts Club in contradistinction to the more metropolitan, and therefore high-status, Bloomsbury group; and Peter Brooker's 'Bohemian girls and new freewomen', primarily a study of Bohemian women associated with the 'Men of 1914' and the ways in which their values and practices differed from – and were constrained by – those of their male equivalents. All these studies redraw the familiar contours of English cultural history by highlighting the values and practices of marginal groupings that played an important part in the making of contemporary culture yet have for the most part been written out of the record.

Above all, however, this thesis has taken the form of an intellectual biography of Jameson's formative years as a writer, tracing the development of her ideas, including ideas on literary technique and aesthetics, within the social, political and cultural context of the day. The intellectual biography attempted here is distinct from normal forms in that its

principle evidence base is Jameson's own fiction, for it is the fiction that is the motor of her thinking, the place where she generates her ideas through her intense intertextual engagement with the work of her contemporaries. Thus, following an initial study of Jameson's early critical writings (articles appearing in the *Gryphon*, the *New Age* and the *Egoist*, together with her M.A. thesis on modern European drama), the primary focus of this thesis has been on her early fiction and its intertexts. Her first two novels, *The Pot Boils* and *The Happy Highways*, have been read in relation to a range of extremist positions emanating from the *New Age*, the *New Freewoman* and the *Egoist*; her next three novels, *The Clash*, *The Pitiful Wife* and *Three Kingdoms*, in relation to the work of D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf, who are seen as representing opposite sides in the 'Battle of the Brows' that occurred during the 1920s and 30s; and, finally, her first trilogy, *The Triumph of Time*, in relation to Wyndham Lewis's *Time and Western Man* and the work of William James.

This thesis has traced Jameson's intellectual journey from democratic socialism at Leeds University, through a socialist variety of anarcho-modernism in pre-war London, to the philosophical, political and aesthetic pragmatism that Jameson developed and strengthened throughout the 1920s and that was to characterise the work of her maturity (Chapters 3–7). In the process, particular emphasis has been placed on Jameson's critical examinations of a range of contemporary modernisms and of the privileged milieus from which these emerged, as well as on her quest for stylistic alternatives better adapted to her own less elitist response to modernity. A combination of intellectual biography and cultural history has seemed the methodological approach best suited to understanding the latter quest – as opposed to a more straight-forwardly literary study – since that quest was so strongly informed by Jameson's political and cultural perspective as an outsider-insider, by her awareness of contemporary thought in such areas as language, philosophy and psychology, and by her literary-critical engagement with her contemporaries.

Jameson's early fiction critiques what she sees as the politically worrying aspects of English modernism in its various forms – its distorting and potentially dangerous

ideological polarities; its hypocrisies; and its social occlusions. It anatomizes both the materialist underpinnings of modernist culture and the various exclusionary strategies adopted by the highbrow to protect what Bourdieu has since called their ‘cultural capital’.² Although she shares English modernism’s critique of abstraction and its heightened awareness of ‘the instabilities of language and meaning’ (DiBattista and MacDiarmid 3), Jameson rejects the exclusionary effects of a compensatory obsession with craftsmanship, experimenting instead with Lawrence’s aesthetic of ‘imperfection’, a down-to-earth documentary fiction, and the populist forms of the carnivalesque and the Wellsian grotesque. Although she also has a very modern sense of psychological fragmentation, she finds expression for it neither in a corresponding fragmentation of form, nor in a subjective stream of consciousness, but in the relatively accessible forms of Freud’s Uncanny, Lawrence’s Brontëan gothic and the persecutory gothic that she derived above all from Walter de la Mare.³ Finally, those polarities of Self and Other that so often prove a vexed problem for English modernists are accommodated in her fiction initially by drawing on Lawrence’s dialogical pluralism and later by adapting William James’s twin models of a verifiable empirical psychology and a mosaic community in which different voices are loosely connected by a common language.

Increasing numbers of critics are advocating the expansion of the definition of modernism far beyond its limited application to a London-based, Anglo-American and male avant-garde. One of the earliest and most prominent of these critics was Bonnie Kime Scott, whose feminist revisioning of the modernist canon, *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology* (1990), was an attempt to put back into modernism some of the energy and creativity that had been ‘subtracted out by gender’ (16). Similarly, in *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance* (1987), Houston Baker sought to redefine modernism along Afro-American lines. More recently a number of queer theorists have sought ‘the inclusion in modernist studies of the experiences of dissident sexual subjects’ (Doan and Garrity 542),

2 See Bourdieu, ‘The Forms of Capital’ (1986).

3 For the influence of Walter de la Mare, see Chapter 5.

while other critics, such as Melba Cuddy-Keane and Susan Stanford Friedman, have argued for an expanded geographical field that would, in turn, necessitate a more flexible historical frame, since ‘cultural versionings of modernism happen in different places at different times’ (Cuddy-Keane, ‘Global’ 562–3).⁴ Could a place for the early Jameson be found within such ‘other’ constructions of modernism?⁵

Certainly, Jameson’s fiction from the 1920s offers examples of a number of the ‘modernist modes of representation’ that Friedman enumerates in her recent ‘re-examination of founding assumptions within the field of Modernist Studies’ (‘Cultural’ 35, 39). These include ‘rupture’ (*The Happy Highways*), ‘multiperspectivity’ (*The Happy Highways*, *The Clash*, *The Pitiful Wife* and *Three Kingdoms*), ‘a crisis of normative certainties’ (all the novels discussed in this thesis) and the narrativizing of ‘the psychodynamic processes of consciousness, memory and desire – embodying or implying the mechanism of repression and the symptomatic return of the repressed’ (*The Happy Highways*, *The Pitiful Wife* and *Three Kingdoms*) (‘Cultural’ 39–40). Yet quite apart from the much debated question of whether such expansions of the modernist field are critically productive,⁶ the absence of one item on Friedman’s list from Jameson’s early fiction – ‘self-reflexivity’ – offers a clue as to why locating it within *any* variety of modernist canon seems, finally, inappropriate (‘Cultural’ 40). Despite the fact that the young Jameson was in many ways an intensely self-conscious writer, her fiction guides the readerly gaze firmly *outwards* – both towards other texts and towards the material and historical world – rather than *inwards* towards itself. Eschewing the self-conscious knowingness with which modernist writers such as Virginia Woolf, T.S. Eliot and James Joyce use their technical virtuosity to create new aesthetic or psychological renderings of the experience of modernity, Jameson’s primary concern in her early fiction is to intervene in the *construction* of modernity, and that not simply culturally, but socially and politically also. It is not surprising, therefore, that although in her introduction to the

4 For Friedman’s views on new geographies of modernism, see ‘Cultural’.

5 For recent surveys of a range of new constructions of modernism, see Tew and Murray, Bradshaw and Dettmar, Part V, and Eysteinsson and Liska.

6 For discussions of this question, see Jacobs, 273; Paxton, 10; and Thacker, ‘Mapping’, 195.

work of Rose Macaulay in *The Gender of Modernism* Susan Squier refers to Jameson as a 'modernist woman writer' in passing (254), she avoids any serious exploration of such a claim, while Jennifer Birkett aptly devises the paradoxical formula of the 'politicised ... Proustian project' to describe Jameson's writing in the 1930s and 40s ('Beginning Again' 10).

As an alternative, Jameson might fruitfully be placed 'outside modernism', alongside other early twentieth-century writers, such as Sylvia Townsend Warner, Patrick Hamilton and Henry Green, who 'deliberately move outside the apparently solid realism in which their fiction seems to be housed in order to discover a radicalism which is at once technical and political' (Lucas, 'From Realism' 204).⁷ There is growing critical recognition that the hypostatization of 'high modernism' as '*the* aesthetic of modernity' (Ardis, *Modernism* 3) has led to neglect of the work of many such interesting stylistically hybrid and/or radical realist writers and a growing number of critics are involved in the project of reversing this neglect.⁸ In *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*, Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti join this project, placing Jameson 'outside modernism' as 'a writer who, like Compton-Burnett and Henry Green, experimented with technique and form while resisting the subjectivism to which much modernist literature succumbed' (11). In its emphasis on Jameson's 'unobtrusive inflections of conventional practice' (Rignall 49), this thesis, too, might be seen as contributing to the same critical project, while its study of the relationship between the style and content of Jameson's early novels, on the one hand, and their cultural context, on the other, supports Rita Felski's important argument that 'the question of what counts as innovative or radical art cannot simply be read off from a formal analysis of the text in question, but requires a careful account of the particular contextual locations and systems of value within which meanings are produced and articulated' (236).

7 *Outside Modernism* is the title of an essay collection by Lynne Hapgood and Nancy L. Paxton which seeks to 'move outside the use of the term modernism as a kind of literary taxonomy and to reconceptualise the relationship between modernism and its early twentieth century *doppelgänger*, realism' (vii).

8 In addition to Hapgood and Paxton's collection, studies of radical realist and/or stylistically hybrid early twentieth-century literature include Klaus, *The Rise*; Pykett; Lucas, *Writing*; DiBattista and MacDiarmid; Kaplan and Simpson; and Lassner.

Focusing in more precisely, however, the young Jameson is perhaps best seen in relation to those other meritocratic outsider-insiders, Rebecca West and D.H. Lawrence.⁹ Although critics are ambivalent when it comes to claiming West and Lawrence for modernism, hesitating in particular over such ‘un-modernist’ characteristics as a perceived awkwardness of style and a pronounced ethical commitment,¹⁰ literary and/or cultural criticism by both writers regularly receives coverage in surveys of modernism and not without justification, for both are well-informed and astute critics of English modernism, whose opinions are all the more valuable for their ‘double vision’ as outsider-insiders.¹¹ Similarly, although – as discussed earlier – recent critics have shown some ambivalence when it comes to claiming Jameson for modernism, some of *her* criticism, too, has been included in a recent anthology of modernism, namely extracts from her *Egoist* article, ‘England’s Nest of Singing Birds’ (1915), and here, too, the editors’ decision seems a valid one, since the article is a knowledgeable if provocative assessment of contemporary (including modernist) literary culture from the perspective of the outsider-insider.¹² Thus although Jameson singles out the Imagists as worthy of critical attention and praises them – in contrast to the moribund Edwardians – for being ‘intent on starting again at the beginning’, she also suggests that their work is limited to a damaging degree by the myopia

9 West and Jameson did not get on. However, these outsider-insider women were alike in their carefully qualified admiration for Lawrence as well as in their disapproval of the authoritarian conservatism of T.S. Eliot.

10 For example, Scott notes that West’s position as ‘an outspoken polemicist’ ‘sets her at odds with traditional, aesthetic definitions of modernism’ and agrees with Woolf’s castigations of her ‘laboured’ style (*Refiguring* 123, 161). Woolf also criticised Lawrence for ‘preaching’ and for a style that ‘pants and jerks’ (*Diary IV*, 126). Michael Bell, in his important essay, ‘Lawrence and Modernism’, argues that Lawrence ‘was not just outside’ English modernism, ‘he was engaged in a parallel project’ and one that ‘did not lend itself to formal perfection’ (179, 193).

11 Criticism/critical theory by Lawrence is included, for example, in Ellmann and Feidelson, Faulkner, Scott, *Gender*, and Kolocotroni, Goldman and Taxidou, but is conspicuous by its absence from Rainey, *Modernism*. Criticism/critical theory by Rebecca West is included in Scott, *Gender*, Kolocotroni, Goldman and Taxidou, and Rainey, *Modernism*, and is discussed by Austin Briggs in ‘Rebecca West vs James Joyce, Samuel Beckett and William Carlos Williams’.

12 Extracts from Jameson’s article appear under the heading ‘Modernists on the Modern: The making of Modernist traditions’ in Kolocotroni, Goldman and Taxidou, 321-3.

attendant on social privilege (176).¹³ ‘There is more weeping in Belgravia over one third-rate poet selling matches in the Strand than over a hundred buried miners’, she sardonically observes, before going on to suggest that Aldington’s work might be improved if he were ‘partially flayed’, and so, presumably, made more sensitive to the material plight of the working classes (176). Michael Bell has argued that despite (or possibly because of) ‘his apparently marginal position’, Lawrence ‘provides one of the most significant critiques of modernism arising from the same historical context and concerns’ (179), while Scott has argued more mildly that ‘West’s writing on social issues and the literary scene helps contextualize modernism’ (*Gender* 562). Once it is understood that Jameson’s criticism is not restricted to a few articles but is a central, if covert, concern throughout her early fiction, it is to be hoped that the importance of her role as a critic of modernism will also be recognised, for, rather than simply contextualizing modernism, such criticism is invaluable in helping us free ourselves from the familiar trap of ‘reading modernism from within its own politics and prejudices’ and in opening up alternative ideological perspectives on the culture of the period (Jacobs 288).

In conclusion, this thesis has sought to use a flexible, mixed methodology to read Jameson’s early novels in ways that bring into focus the deep engagement with contemporary culture and the incisive critical intelligence that inform them. Read in the light of a detailed knowledge of their historical contexts, these novels no longer appear the clumsy versions of popular fiction that baffled critics have previously assumed them to be; instead, they emerge as a series of stylistically hybrid, intertextual dialogues in which the young Jameson works through her ideas on contemporary culture and society and the relationship between them, challenging us in the process to question some of our most deeply held assumptions about the culture of the period. As a writer in formation in these early novels, the young Jameson seeks to give cognizance to modern ideas on such topics

13 The references given here are from Jameson’s original *Egoist* article, but all material quoted is also present in Kolocotroni et al. For previous references to ‘England’s Nest’, see pp. 55-6, p. 90 and p. 109 above.

as language, time and the self, whilst refusing to give up a socialist belief in the value of inclusive communities within a material world and in the role of art in constructing such communities. Although she would continue to adapt and reinvent herself as a writer, the response to modernity that Jameson evolved in the 1920s would have a lasting impact on her work, in which a politically grounded realism continues to be haunted by the ghostly traces of a modernism that is at once appropriated and denied.

WORKS CITED AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Storm Jameson (in chronological order)

[as Jim]. 'The Unreality of Art.' *Gryphon* Feb. 1912: 36.

[as Jim]. 'To the Editor: The Unreality of Art.' *Gryphon* June 1912: 93–4.

'The End Thereof.' *New Age* 20 Mar. 1913: 482–3.

'The Drama of Ideas since Ibsen.' *Egoist* 15 Jan. 1914: 29–30.

'Modern Dramatists I.' *Egoist* 16 Feb. 1914: 74–5.

'Modern Dramatists II.' *Egoist* 16 Mar. 1914: 116–17.

'New Statesmen: A Bill Providing for an Economic Basis of Marriage.' *New Age* 2 Apr. 1914: 682.

Rev. of *The Melting Pot*, by Israel Zangwill. Queen's Theatre. *Helen with the High Hand*. Vaudeville Theatre. *Egoist* 15 Apr. 1914: 155–6.

'England's Nest of Singing Birds.' *Egoist* 1 Nov. 1915: 175–6.

Reply to letter of Miss Pully. *Egoist* 1 Jan. 1916: 14–15.

'A Plea for the Arbitrary Limit.' *New Age* 7 Sept. 1916: 447–8.

Rev. of *Essays and Poems*, by Voltairine le Cleyre; *Anarchism and Other Essays*, by Emma Goldman; *The Soul of Woman*, by Paul Jordan Smith; *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*, by Emma Goldman; and *History of the Fabian Society*, by Edward R. Pease. *Egoist* Sept. 1916: 135–6.

'The Scene-Models of Norman Macdermott.' *Egoist* Jan. 1917: 3–4.

The Pot Boils. London: Constable, 1919.

'The Woman Doctor's Tale: Mother Love.' *The New Decameron*. Ed. Michael Sadleir. Vol.1. Oxford: Blackwell, 1919. 78–104.

Modern Drama in Europe. London: Collins, 1920.

The Happy Highways. London: Heinemann, 1920.

'The Genius of Katherine Mansfield.' *Voices* Jan. 1921: 10–12.

'England and America.' *English Review* Jan.–June 1921: 137–141; 213–15; 320–8.

The Clash. London: Heinemann, 1922.

- 'The Tale of the Solitary English Girl: The Pitiful Wife.' *The New Decameron*. Ed. Michael Sadleir. Vol. 3. Oxford: Blackwell, 1922. 56–71.
- 'Mr. de la Mare and the Grotesque.' *English Review* May 1922: 424–30.
- The Pitiful Wife*. London: Constable, 1923.
- Lady Susan and Life: An Indiscretion*. London: Chapman and Dodd, 1923.
- Three Kingdoms*. London: Constable, 1926.
- Farewell to Youth*. New York: Knopf, 1928.
- Full Circle*. London: Blackwell, 1928.
- The Georgian Novel and Mr. Robinson*. New York: Morrow, 1929.
- The Decline of Merry England*. London: Cassell, 1930.
- Rev. of *The Waves*, by Virginia Woolf. *Fortnightly Review* Nov. 1931: 677–78.
- The Triumph of Time*. London: Heinemann, 1932.
- That Was Yesterday*. 1932. New York: Berkley Medallion, 1976.
- 'Man the Helpmate.' *Man, Proud Man*. Ed. Mabel Ulrich. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1932. 105–36.
- A Day Off*. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1933.
- No Time Like the Present*. London: Cassell, 1933.
- Company Parade*. 1934. London: Virago, 1982.
- Love in Winter*. London: Cassell, 1935.
- The Soul of Man in the Age of Leisure*. London: Nott, 1935.
- None Turn Back*. London: Cassell, 1936.
- In The Second Year*. 1936. Ed. Stan Smith. Nottingham: Trent, 2004.
- The Moon is Making*. London: Cassell, 1937.
- Delicate Monster*. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1937.
- 'Documents.' *Fact* July 1937: 9–18.
- Civil Journey*. London: Cassell, 1939.
- The Journal of Mary Hervey Russell*. London: Macmillan, 1945.

The Writer's Situation. London: Macmillan, 1950.

Foreword. *Ten Minute Stories and Some Others*. By Gerald Bullett. London: Dent, 1959. v–viii.

Journey From the North. 2 vols. London: Collins and Harvill, 1969–70.

Parthian Words. London: Collins and Harvill, 1970.

Unpublished Archive Material

'The University of Leeds,' ts. Brotherton Collection. Leeds U Lib.

Letters to Valentine Dobrée. Dobrée Papers. Brotherton Collection. Leeds U Lib.

Letter to Thomas Moul. Thomas Moul Papers. Brotherton Collection. Leeds U Lib.

Letters to John Middleton Murry. Ms. 2515. John Middleton Murry Papers. Special Collections. Edinburgh U Lib.

Letters to Dora Marsden. C0283. B1, F19. Dora Marsden Collection. Manuscript Division. Princeton U Lib.

Secondary Sources

AER. 'Views and Reviews.' *New Age* 20 Mar. 1913: 480.

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Allen, Renée. 'Introduction to Volume X of *The New Age*.' 20 Mar. 2009
<http://dl.lib.brown.edu/mjp/render.php?id=mjp.2005.00.011&view=mjp_object>

'Anarchism.' *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 1910. 28 Nov. 2009
<http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/kropotkin/britanniaanarchy.html>.

Antliff, Mark. *Inventing Bergson: Cultural Politics and the Parisian Avant-Garde*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1993.

'Aphorisms.' *Gryphon* Feb. 1912: 44.

Ardis, Ann L. 'Debating Feminism, Modernism, Socialism: Beatrice Hastings's Voices in the *New Age*.' *Gender in Modernism: New Geographies, Complex Intersections*. Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2007. 310–59.

—. 'The Dialogics of Modernism(s) in *The New Age*.' *MODERNISM/Modernity* 14 (2007): 407–34.

—. *Modernism and Cultural Conflict, 1880–1922*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.

Armstrong, Tim. *Modernism: A Cultural History*. London: Polity, 2005.

- A.R.T. 'Fascinating Freddy.' *Gryphon* Mar. 1911: 59.
- Baker, H.A. *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1987.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- . *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- Beasley, Rebecca. *Ezra Pound and the Visual Culture of Modernism*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- Bell, Michael. 'D.H. Lawrence and Modernism'. *The Cambridge Companion to D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. Anne Fernihough. Cambridge: CUP, 2001. 179–96.
- Bennett, Arnold. 'Is the Novel Decaying?' *Virginia Woolf: The Critical Heritage*. Eds. Robin Majumdar and Allen McLaurin. London: RKP, 1975. 112–14.
- Bergson, Henri. *Henri Bergson: Key Writings*. Eds. Keith Ansell Pearson and John Mullarkey. *Mélanges*. Trans. Melissa McMahon. NY: Continuum, 2002.
- Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Birch, Dinah and Francis O'Gorman, eds. *Ruskin and Gender*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
- Birkett, Jennifer. 'Beginning Again: Storm Jameson's Debt to France.' *Critical Survey* 10.3 (1995): 3–12.
- . 'Doubly Determined: The Ambition of Storm Jameson.' *Determined Women: Studies in the Construction of the Female Subject, 1919–1990*. Eds. Jennifer Birkett and Elizabeth Harvey. Savage, Md: Barnes and Noble, 1991. 69–94.
- . 'A Fictional Function: Storm Jameson and W. H. Auden.' *English* 56 (2007): 171–85.
- . *Margaret Storm Jameson: A Life*. Oxford: OUP, 2009.
- . 'Margaret Storm Jameson and the London PEN Centre: Mobilising Commitment.' *E-rea* 4.2 (2006). 20 Mar. 2009 <<http://erea.revues.org/index256.html>>
- . 'Re-imagining Nations, Rewriting Lives: The Image of France in the Autofictions of Storm Jameson and Assia Djebar.' *Romance Studies* 23.1 (2005): 15–28.
- . "'The Spectacle of Europe': Politics, PEN and Prose Fiction. The Work of Storm Jameson in the Inter-War Years.' *Women in Europe between the Wars: Politics, Culture and Society*. Eds. Angela Kershaw and Angela Kimyongür. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. 25–38.
- Birkett, Jennifer and Chiara Briganti, eds. *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. R. Nice. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1984.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 'The Forms of Capital.' *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Ed. J. Richardson. New York: Greenwood, 1986. 241–58.
- Bradley, Malcolm and James McFarlane, eds. *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature, 1890–1930*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Bradshaw, David, ed. *A Concise Companion to Modernism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Bradshaw, David and Kevin J. H. Dettmar, eds. *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Bridgwater, Patrick. 'Edward Carpenter and Nietzsche.' *German Studies at the Millenium*. Ed. Neil Thomas. Durham: Durham UP, 1999. 197–223.
- Briganti, Chiara. 'Mirroring the Darkness: Storm Jameson and the Collective Novel.' *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. Eds. Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 71–92.
- . 'Stern Cassandra: Storm Jameson, War and Modernity.' *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 5.2 (1999): 63–80.
- . "'Thou art full of Stirs, a tumultuous City": Storm Jameson and London in the 1920's.' *The Swarming Streets: Twentieth-Century Literary Representations of London*. Ed. Lawrence Phillips. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 61–75.
- Briggs, Austin. 'Rebecca West vs James Joyce, Samuel Beckett and William Carlos Williams'. *Joyce in the Hibernian Metropolis: Essays*. Eds. Morris Beja and David Norris. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1996. 83–102.
- Brooker, Peter. *Bohemia in London: The Social Scene of Early Modernism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Brown, Tony, ed. *Edward Carpenter and Late Victorian Radicalism*. London: Cass, 1990.
- Burke, L. 'Sexual Subjects: Discourses of Sexuality, Class and Culture in Selected Works by Maria Stopes, Rebecca West, Dorothy L. Sayers and Storm Jameson in Britain in the Inter-war Period.' Diss. Southampton U, 1988.
- Burke, Peter. *Varieties of Cultural History*. Cambridge: Polity, 1997.
- Cachin, Marie-Françoise. "'Non-governmental Society": Edward Carpenter's Position in the British Socialist Movement.' *Edward Carpenter and Late Victorian Radicalism*. Ed. Tony Brown. London: Cass, 1990. 58–73.
- Carey, John. *The Intellectual and the Masses*. London: Faber, 1992.
- Carpenter, Edward. *The Art of Creation*. 1904. Enl.ed. London: Allen, 1907.
- . *Civilisation: Its Cause and Cure*. 1889. London: Allen and Unwin, 1921.

- Carpenter, Edward. *England's Ideal*. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1887.
- . *Love's Coming of Age*. 1896. Carpenter. *Selected Writings*, Vol. 1: *Sex*. London: GMP, 1984. 95–183.
- . *Towards Democracy*. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1911.
- Carter, Angela. Preface. *Memoirs of a Midget*. By Walter De la Mare. Oxford: OUP, 1982. vii–xxiii.
- Carter, Huntly. 'Art: William Blake.' *New Age* 27 Apr. 1911: 616–17.
- . 'The "Blue Bird" and Bergson in Paris.' *New Age* 11 May 1911: 43–5.
- . 'The Meistersingers' Mood.' *New Age* 24 Aug. 1911: 392–3. Pt. 6 of a series, Letter from Abroad: The New Idea of Dramatic Action, begun 20 July 1911.
- . 'The Rebuilding of the Theatre: The New Vision.' *New Age* 1 June 1911: 111–13.
- . 'The Russian Ballets in Paris and London.' *New Age* 29 June 1911: 209–211.
- . 'The Static Theatre.' *New Age* 10 Aug. 1911: 345–7. Pt. 4 of a series, Letter from Abroad: The Idea of Dramatic Action, begun 20 July 1911.
- Cashman, Sean Dennis. *America in the Age of the Titans: The Progressive Era and World War I*. NY: New York UP, 1988.
- Chapman, Guy. *A Passionate Prodigality*. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1933.
- Chaudhuri, Amit. *D. H. Lawrence and 'Difference'*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2003.
- Churchill, Suzanne. *The Little Magazine 'Others' and the Renovation of Modern American Poetry*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Clarke, Bruce. *Dora Marsden and Early Modernism: Gender, Individualism, Science*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1996.
- Clay, Catherine. *British Women Writers 1914–1945: Professional Work and Friendship*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard UP, 1988.
- Colls, Robert and Philip Dodds, eds. *Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880–1920*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Comentale, Edward P. and Andrzej Gasiorek, eds. *T. E. Hulme and the Question of Modernism*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Conrad, Joseph. *The Heart of Darkness*. 1902. London: Pan, 1976.

- [Cook, Marjorie Grant]. Rev. of *Lady Susan and Life: An Indiscretion*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 24 Jan. 1924: 52.
- . Rev. of *Three Kingdoms*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 4 March 1926: 160.
- . Rev. of *The Voyage Home*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 30 Jan. 1930: 76.
- Copley, Anthony. *A Spiritual Bloomsbury: Hinduism and Sexuality in the Lives and Writings of Edward Carpenter, E.M. Forster, and Christopher Isherwood*. Lanham MD: Lexington, 2006.
- ‘The Court Dinner.’ *Gryphon* Mar. 1912: 50.
- [Cowling, George]. Rev. of *The Pot Boils*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 6 Feb. 1919: 63.
- Coyle, Michael. *Ezra Pound, Popular Genres and the Discourse of Culture*. U Park, Penn: Penn. State UP, 1995.
- Cuddy-Keane, Melba. ‘Afterword: Inside and Outside the Covers: Beginnings, Endings and Woolf’s Non-Coercive Ethical Texts.’ *Woolfian Boundaries*. Eds. Anna Burrells et al. Clemson: Clemson U Digital P, 2007. 172–81.
- . ‘Global Modernisms.’ *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture*. Eds. David Bradshaw and Kevin J.H. Dettmar. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. 558–64.
- . *Virginia Woolf, the Intellectual and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- Cunningham, Bonnie Wilde. ‘Autobiography and Anaesthesia: Ernest Hemingway, Storm Jameson and Me.’ *Women’s Studies* 24 (1995): 615–29.
- Daugherty, Beth Rigel. ‘The Whole Contention between Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Woolf.’ *Virginia Woolf: Centennial Essays*. Eds. Elaine I. C. Ginsberg and Laura Moss Gottlieb. Troy, NY: Whiston, 1983. 269–94.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H. M. Parshley. London: Picador, 1988.
- De la Mare, Walter. *Memoirs of a Midget*. 1921. Oxford: OUP, 1982.
- De Segonzac, A. ‘Les Boxeurs.’ *New Age* 18 Jan. 1912. Art Supplement.
- Delavenay, Emile. *D. H. Lawrence and Edward Carpenter: A Study in Edwardian Transition*. London: Heinemann, 1971.
- DiBattista, Maria and Lucy McDiarmid, eds. *High and Low Moderns: Literature and Culture, 1889–1939*. Oxford: OUP, 1996.
- Doan, Laura and Jane Garrity. ‘Modernism Queered.’ *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture*. Eds. David Bradshaw and Kevin J.H. Dettmar. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. 542–550.
- Dodd, Philip. ‘Englishness and the National Culture.’ *Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880–1920*. Eds. Robert Colls and Philip Dodd. London: Croom Helm, 1986. 1–28.

- Doyle, Brian. 'The Invention of English Culture.' *Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880–1920*. Eds. Robert Colls and Philip Dodd. London: Croom Helm, 1986. 89–115.
- Draper, R. P., ed. *D. H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage*. London: RKP, 1970.
- 'Duke of Devonshire Sells Famous House.' *New York Times* 6 Sept. 1919:9. 28 Nov. 2009 <<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9C06E3DE153AE03ABC4E53DFBF668382609EDE>>
- Dukes, Ashley. *Modern Dramatists*. London: Palmer, 1911.
- . 'Pomp and Pageantry.' *New Age* 4 July 1907: 150.
- Edwards, Paul. *Wyndham Lewis: Painter and Writer*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.
- Eggert, Paul. 'The Biographical Issue: Lives of Lawrence.' *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence*. Ed. Anne Fernihough. Cambridge: CUP, 2001. 157–77.
- Eliot, George. *Adam Bede*. 1859. London: Penguin, 1980.
- Ellmann, Richard and Charles Feidelson, J.R., eds. *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature*. New York: OUP, 1965.
- Eysteinsson, Astradur and Vivian Liska, eds. *Modernism*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 2007.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skins, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto, 1986.
- Faulkner, Peter, ed. *A Modernist Reader: Modernism in England 1910–1930*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1986.
- Felski, Rita. 'Modernism and Modernity: Engendering Literary History.' *Modernism*. Ed. Michael E. Whitworth. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007. 228–43.
- Fernihough, Anne. 'Go in fear of abstractions': modernism and the spectre of democracy.' *Textual Practice* 14 (2000): 479–97.
- Fernihough, Anne. *D. H. Lawrence: Aesthetics and Ideology*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Fernihough, Anne, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
- Ferrall, Charles. 'The *New Age* and the Emergence of Reactionary Modernism Before the Great War.' *Modern Fiction Studies* 38 (1992): 653–67.
- Fletcher, John and James McFarlane. 'Modernist Drama: Origins and Patterns.' *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature, 1890–1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradley and James McFarlane. London: Penguin, 1991. 499–513.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Selected Papers on Hysteria and Other Psychoneuroses*. Trans. A. A. Brill. 2nd ed. NY: Nervous and Mental Disease Pub. Co., 1912.

- Freud, Sigmund. *The Uncanny*. Trans. David McLintock. London: Penguin, 2003.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. 'Cultural Parataxis and Transnational Landscapes of Reading: Toward a Locational Modernist Studies.' *Modernism*. Eds. Astradur Eysteinnsson and Vivian Liska. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 2007. 35–52.
- . 'Definitional Excursions: The Meaning of Modern/Modernity/Modernism.' *MODERNISM/Modernity* 8 (2001): 493–513.
- Furness, R. S. *Expressionism*. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Gan, Wendy. 'Civil Journey: Meditating the Personal and the Political in the Essays of Storm Jameson.' *Connotations* 8 (1998/99): 201–16.
- . 'The Complexities of Modernity: Women's Essays Between the Wars.' Diss. London U, 1998.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham: Duke UP, 2006.
- Garver, Lee. 'Hulme Among the Progressives.' *T. E. Hulme and the Question of Modernism*. Eds. Edward P. Comentale and Andrzej Gasiorek. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 133–47.
- Gasiorek, Andrzej. *Wyndham Lewis and Modernism*. Tavistock: Northcote, 2004.
- Gaudier-Brzeska, Henri. 'The New Sculpture.' *Egoist* 16 Mar. 1914: 118.
- Gay, John D. *The Geography of Religion in England*. London: Duckworth, 1971.
- Gennette, Gerard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 1997.
- Gerrard, Deborah. "'The Tempestuous Morning Energy of a New Art': Socialism, Modernism, and the Young Storm Jameson.' *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. Eds. Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 19–35.
- . 'Brown-Ness, Trees, Rose Petals and Chrysalises: The Influence of Edward Carpenter's Mystical Evolutionary Socialism on the Writing of Virginia Woolf, with Particular Reference to *The Years*.' *Woolfian Boundaries*. Eds. Anna Burrells et al. Clemson: Clemson U Digital P, 2007. 15–22.
- Gershenowitz, Harry. 'Two Lamarckians: Walt Whitman and Edward Carpenter.' *Walt Whitman Review* 2.1(1984): 35–9.
- Gibbons, Tom. *Rooms in the Darwin Hotel: Studies in English Literary Criticism and Ideas, 1880–1920*. Nedlands, WA: U of Western Australia P, 1973.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. 'Some Notes towards a Vindication of the Rites of D. H. Lawrence.' *Approaches to Teaching the Works of D. H. Lawrence*. Eds. M. Elizabeth Sargent and Garry Watson. NY: MLA, 2001. 41–7.

- Gillies, Mary Ann. *Henry Bergson and British Modernism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1996.
- Gloversmith, Frank. *Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s*. Sussex: Harvester, 1980.
- G.M.D. 'Women's Discussion Society.' *Gryphon* Feb. 1912: 47.
- Golubov, Nattie. 'English Ethical Socialism: women writers, political ideas and the public sphere between the wars.' *Women's History Review* 14.1 (2005): 33–59.
- Gray, Stephen. *Beatrice Hastings: A Literary Life*. London: Penguin, 2004.
- Griffin, Roger. *Modernism and Fascism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Hapgood, Lynne and Nancy L. Paxton. *Outside Modernism: In Pursuit of the English Novel, 1900–30*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Harland, Oswald H. *Dominance: A Novel*. London: Knopf, 1929.
- . *The Golden Plough*. London: Knopf, 1929.
- . 'The Triumph of Lucifer.' *New Age* 2 July 1914: 207–8 .
- Hartland, Oslaf [Oswald Harland]. 'Ash Wednesday.' *New Age* 3 Apr. 1913: 526.
- . 'Iconoclasm.' *New Age* 6 Feb. 1913: 331–2.
- Harland, Sydney. *Nine Lives: The Autobiography of a Yorkshire Scientist*. Ed. Max Millard. Boson Books, 2001. 20 Mar. 2009
<<http://www.bosonbooks.com/boson/freebies/harland/harland.pdf>>
- . 'Raving of an Immature Science Student.' *New Age* 13 Feb. 1913: 360.
- S.O. [Austin Harrison]. 'The First Woman Critic.' *English Review* Jan. 1921: 57–62.
- Hastings, Beatrice. 'The Black Peril in South Africa.' Reply to T.A.R. Purchar. *New Age* 24 Aug. 1911: 404–5.
- . 'The Black Peril in South Africa.' Reply to T.A.R. Purchar. *New Age* 19 Oct. 1911: 598.
- . 'The Black Peril.' Reply to William Marwick. *New Age* 9 Nov. 1911: 46.
- . 'Feminism and Common Sense.' Reply to Bertha Morley. *New Age* 7 Aug. 1913: 438–9.
- . 'Race Management.' Letter. *New Age* 6 Mar. 1913: 436–7.
- . Reply to George Hirst. *New Age* 17 Apr. 1913: 592–3.
- . 'The White Slave Traffic.' Reply to Violet Mayne. *New Age* 9 Jan. 1913: 237.

- Morning, Alice. [Hastings, Beatrice] 'The Lady.' *New Age* 25 Aug. 1910: 395–6.
- A Reluctant Suffragette. [Hastings, Beatrice] 'The Other Women.' *New Age* 4 July 1908: 187.
- Tina, Beatrice. [Hastings, Beatrice] *Woman's Worst Enemy: Woman*. London: New Age, 1909.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Scarlet Letter*. 1850. New York: Penguin, 1983.
- H. B. C. 'The Reality of Art.' *Gryphon* Mar. 1912: 54.
- H.C.P. 'Social Study Society.' *Gryphon* Dec. 1910: 29.
- Hollington, Michael. 'Lawrentian Gothic and the Uncanny.' *Anglophonia* 15 (2004): 171–84.
- Holtby, Winifred. *Virginia Woolf: A Critical Memoir*. 1932. Chicago: Academy, 1978.
- Hulme, T. E. *The Collected Writings of T. E. Hulme*. Ed. Karen Csengeri. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Humma, John. 'D. H. Lawrence.' *Gothic Writers*. Eds. Douglass H. Thomson, Jack G. Voller and Frederick S. Frank. Westport, Conn: Greenwood, 2002. 232–40.
- Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1986.
- Hynes, Samuel. *Edwardian Occasions: Essays on English Writing in the Early Twentieth Century*. London: RKP, 1972.
- Igdrasil. 'Forthcoming Lectures.' *Gryphon* Mar. 1912: 57.
- 'Imaginary Interviews: Professor Grant.' *Gryphon* Mar. 1912: 56–7.
- Innes, Christopher, 'Modernism in Drama.' *Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: CUP, 1999. 130–156.
- Jacobs, Deborah. 'Feminist Criticism/Cultural Studies/Modernist Texts: A Manifesto for the '90s.' *Rereading Modernism: New Directions in Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Lisa Rado. New York: Garland, 1994. 273–98.
- Jaffe, Aaron. *Modernism and the Culture of Celebrity*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- James, William. *Essays in Radical Empiricism*. London: Longmans, 1912.
- . *Pragmatism*. NY: Longmans, 1907.
- . *The Principles of Psychology*. 1890. 20 Mar. 2009
<http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/James/Principles/index.htm>>
- . *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy*. London: Longmans, 1910.

- J.C. 'Women's Discussion Society.' *Gryphon* Nov. 1910: 14; Dec. 1910: 32.
- Joannou, Maroula. 'Storm Jameson's *Journey from the North* as Political Autobiography.' *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. Eds. Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 147–64.
- Jones, Ernest. *Papers on Psycho-analysis*. 4th ed. London: Baillière, 1938.
- Kadlec, David. *Mosaic Modernisms: Anarchism, Pragmatism, Culture*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 2000.
- Kallen, Horace Meyer. *William James and Henri Bergson*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1914.
- Kaplan, Carola M. and Anne B. Simpson, eds. *Seeing Double: Revisioning Edwardian and Modernist Literature*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Kenney, Rowland. 'Education for the Workers II.' *New Age* 26 Mar. 1914: 652–3.
- Kinhead-Weekes, Mark. *D. H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile, 1912–1922*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.
- Kipling, Rudyard. 'A Centurion of the Thirtieth.' Kipling. *Puck of Pook's Hill*. London: Macmillan, 1906, 137–62.
- Klaus, Gustav H. *The Rise of Socialist Fiction, 1880–1914*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987.
- Klaus, H. Gustav and Stephen Knight, eds. 'To Hell With Culture': *Anarchism in British Twentieth Century Literature*. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2005.
- Kolocotroni, Vassiliki, Jane Goldman and Olga Taxidou, eds. *Modernism: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1998.
- Labon, Joanna. 'Tracing Storm Jameson.' *Women: A Cultural Review* 8.1 (1977): 34–47.
- Lapoujade, David. 'From Transcendental Empiricism to Worker Nomadism: William James.' *Pli* 9 (2000): 190–9.
- Lassner, Phyllis. *British Women Writers of World War II: Battlegrounds of their Own*. London: Macmillan, 1997.
- Lawrence, D. H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. 1928. Ed. Michael Squires. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
- . *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*. 1914. Ed. Anthony Atkins. Oxford: OUP, 1995.
- . *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*. 1921, 1922. Ed. and introd. Bruce Steele. Cambridge: CUP, 2004.
- . *The Rainbow*. 1915. Ed. Mark Kinhead-Weekes. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.
- . *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine*. 1925. Ed. Michael Herbert. Cambridge: CUP, 1988.

- Lawrence, D. H. *Selected Short Stories*. Ed. Brian Finney. London: Penguin, 1982.
- . *Sons and Lovers*. 1913. Eds. Helen Baron and Carl Baron. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- . *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Eds. Ezra Greenspan, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- . *Three Novellas: The Ladybird, The Fox, The Captain's Doll*. 1923. London: Penguin-Heinemann, 1960.
- . *The Trespasser*. 1912. Ed. Elizabeth Mansfield. Cambridge: CUP, 1981.
- . *The White Peacock*. 1911. Ed. and introd. David Bradshaw. Oxford: OUP, 1997.
- . *Women in Love*. 1921. Eds. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- Lentricchia, Frank. *Modernist Quartet*. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
- Levenson, Michael. *A Genealogy of Modernism*. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.
- Levin, Jonathan. *The Poetics of Transition: Emerson, Pragmatism and American Literary Modernism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999.
- Lewis, Matthew. *The Monk*. 1796. Ed. Howard Anderson. Oxford: OUP, 1980.
- Lewis, Wyndham. *The Art of Being Ruled*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1926.
- . *Paleface: The Philosophy of the 'Melting Pot'*. 1929. NY: Gordon, 1972.
- . *Tarr*. 1918. London: Penguin, 1982.
- . *Time and Western Man*. 1927. Ed. Paul Edwards. Santa Rosa: Black Sparrow, 1993.
- Light, Alison. *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism Between the Wars*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- . *Mrs. Woolf and the Servants*. London: Penguin, 2007.
- Little John. 'Of Culture and the Cultured Person.' *Gryphon* Nov. 1910: 9.
- Lloyd, T. O. *Empire, Welfare State, Europe: History of the United Kingdom, 1906–2001*. 5th ed. Oxford: OUP, 2005.
- Lodge, David. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Lucas, John. 'From Realism to Radicalism: Sylvia Townsend Warner, Patrick Hamilton and Henry Green in the 1920s'. *Outside Modernism: In Pursuit of the English Novel, 1900–1930*. Eds. Lynne Hapgood and Nancy L. Paxton. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000. 203–23.
- . *The Radical Twenties*. Nottingham: Five Leaves, 1997.

- Ludovici, Anthony. *Nietzsche and Art*. London: Constable, 1911.
- MacGregor, David. *The Evolution of Industry*. London: Fisher, 1911.
- Mackenzie, Compton. *Sinister Street*. London: Secker, 1923.
- Mairet, Philip. *A. R. Orage: A Memoir*. London: Dent, 1936.
- Malory, Sir Thomas. *The Birth, Life and Acts of King Arthur*. London: Dent, 1894.
- Mansfield, Katherine. 'The Little Governess.' Mansfield. *The Collected Short Stories*. London: Penguin, 1981. 174–89.
- Marker, Frederick J. and Lise-Lone Marker. *Strindberg and Modernist Theatre: Post-Inferno Drama on the Stage*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
- Marsden, Dora. 'The Art of the Future.' *New Freewoman* 1 Nov. 1913: 181–3.
- . 'I AM.' *Egoist* 1 Jan. 1915: 1–4.
- . Letters to Harriet Shaw Weaver. Ms. 57354. Harriet Shaw Weaver Papers. British Lib.
- . 'Men, Machines and Progress.' *Egoist* 2 Feb. 1914: 41–4.
- . 'Tales for the Attentive.' *New Freewoman* 1 Oct. 1913: 141–4.
- . 'Views and Comments.' *New Freewoman* 15 June 1913: 3–5.
- . 'Views and Comments.' *New Freewoman* 15 July 1913: 22–4.
- . 'Views and Comments.' *New Freewoman* 15 Oct. 1913: 163–6.
- . 'Views and Comments.' *Egoist* 1 June 1914: 203–6.
- . 'Views and Comments.' *Egoist* 15 Sept. 1914: 344–6.
- Martin, Wallace. *The 'New Age' under Orage*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1967.
- McCracken, Scott. 'Writing the Body: Edward Carpenter, George Gissing and Late-Nineteenth-Century Realism.' *Edward Carpenter and Late Victorian Radicalism*. Ed. Tony Brown. London: Cass, 1990. 178–200.
- McLoughlin, Kate. 'Voices and Values: Storm Jameson's *Europe to Let* and the Munich Pact.' *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. Eds. Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 109–26.
- McNeil, Helen. 'Vortex Marsden: A Little Magazine and the Making of Modernity.' *Journalism, Literature and Modernity: From Hazlitt to Modernism*. Ed. Kate Campbell. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. 141–69.
- Meyers, Jeffrey, ed. *Wyndham Lewis: A Revaluation*. London: Athlone, 1980.

- Midge. Letter. *Gryphon* Mar. 1912: 5.
- Miesel, Victor H., ed. *Voices of German Expressionism*. London: Tate, 2003.
- Michelucci, Stefania. 'Laying the Ghost: D. H. Lawrence's Fight with Ruskin.' *Ruskin and Modernism*. Eds. Giovanni Cianci and Peter Nicholls. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. 181–93.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. London: Virago, 1977.
- Milton, Colin. *Lawrence and Nietzsche: A Study of Influence*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1987.
- Moi, Toril. *Henrik Ibsen and the Birth of Modernism: Art, Theater, Philosophy*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
- Montague, C. E. *Right Off the Map*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1927.
- Montefiore, Janet. *Men and Women Writers of the 1930s*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Moody, A. David. *Ezra Pound: Poet*. Vol. 1. *The Young Genius, 1885–1920*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Moorman, Frederic. Diary 1913, ts. Special Collections. Brotherton Lib., U of Leeds.
- Morrison, Mark S. *The Public Face of Modernism*. Madison, Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P, 2001.
- Munton, Alan. 'Abstraction, Archaism and the Future: T. E. Hulme, Jacob Epstein and Wyndham Lewis.' *T. E. Hulme and the Question of Modernism*. Eds. Edward P. Comentale and Andrzej Gasiorek. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 73–91.
- Murphy, Richard. 'Expressionism.' *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture*. Eds. David Bradshaw and Kevin J. H. Dettmar. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. 198–203.
- Newey, Vincent. 'Wordsworth, Bunyan and the Puritan Mind.' *English Literary History* 41 (1974): 212–32.
- Newman, Judie. *The Ballistic Bard: Postcolonial Fictions*. London: Arnold, 1995.
- Nicholls, Peter. *Modernisms: A Literary Guide*. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Douglas Smith. Oxford: OUP, 1996.
- . *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. London: Penguin, 2003.
- Nixon, Cornelia. *Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.
- Nord, Deborah Epstein. *The Apprenticeship of Beatrice Webb*. Amherst: U of Mass. P, 1985.
- North, Michael. *Reading 1922: A Return to the Scene of the Modern*. Oxford: OUP, 1999.

- Orage, Alfred. 'Concerning "The New Age".' *New Age* 28 Jan. 1909: 280.
- . 'The Education of Democracy.' *New Age* 28 Dec. 1907: 167–8. Pt. 10 of series, Towards Socialism, begun 3 Oct. 1907.
- . *Friedrich Nietzsche: The Dionysian Spirit of the Age*. London: Foulis, 1906.
- . 'The Future of the "New Age".' *New Age* 2 May 1907: 8.
- . 'The Infant, Democracy.' *New Age* 30 Nov. 1907: 89. Pt. 9 of series, Towards Socialism, begun 3 Oct. 1907.
- . 'A Mystical Interlude.' *New Age* 11 Mar. 1909: 399
- . *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism*. London: Foulis, 1906.
- . 'Notes of the Week.' *New Age* 30 Nov. 1911: 97–100; 29 Aug. 1912: 409–414; 27 Feb. 1913: 393–5;
- . 'Sacrifice to Society.' *New Age* 14 Nov. 1907: 49–50. Pt. 7 of series, Towards Socialism, begun 3 Oct. 1907.
- . 'Towards Socialism: III.' *New Age* 17 Oct. 1907: 393–4. Pt. 3 of series, Towards Socialism, begun 3 Oct. 1907.
- . 'Unedited Opinions: The End of Man.' *New Age* 25 May 1911: 84.
- . 'Unedited Opinions: On Action in Drama.' *New Age* 15 Feb. 1912: 371–2.
- . 'Unedited Opinions: On Drama.' *New Age* 18 May 1911: 58.
- . 'Unedited Opinions: The Superman.' *New Age* 1 Dec. 1910: 107.
- . 'Votes for Women.' *New Age* 4 Feb. 1909: 300.
- [Orlo, William]. Rev. of *The Happy Highways*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 16 Sept. 1920: 974.
- . Rev. of *The Pitiful Wife*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 30 Aug. 1923: 571.
- Ouditt, Sharon. 'Finding Words for War: Men, Women and World War I in the Fiction of Storm Jameson.' *Margaret Storm Jameson: Writing in Dialogue*. Eds. Jennifer Birkett and Chiara Briganti. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 53–70.
- Pinkney, Tony. *D. H. Lawrence and Modernism*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1990.
- Plottel, Jeanine Parisier and Hanna Charney, eds. *Intertextuality: New Perspectives in Criticism*. NY: NY Lit. Forum, 1978.
- Pound, Ezra. 'The Divine Mystery.' *New Freewoman* 15 Nov. 1913: 207–8.

- Pound, Ezra. 'Gaudier-Brzeska.' *New Age* 4 Feb. 1915: 380–2. 5th part of a series, Affirmations, begun 7 Jan. 1915.
- . 'Jacob Epstein.' *New Age* 21 Jan. 1915: 311–12. 3rd part of a series, Affirmations, begun 7 Jan. 1915.
- . 'The New Sculpture.' *Egoist* 16 Feb 1914: 67–8.
- . 'A Retrospect.' 1918. *A Modernist Reader: Modernism in England, 1910–1930*. Ed. Peter Faulkner. London: Batsford, 1986. 59–71.
- . 'The Serious Artist.' *New Freewoman* 15 Oct. 1913: 161–3; 1 Nov. 1913: 194–5; 15 Nov. 1913: 213–14.
- . 'Vorticism.' *New Age* 14 Jan. 1915: 277–8. 2nd part of a series, Affirmations, begun 7 Jan. 1915.
- . 'Wyndham Lewis'. *Egoist* 15 June 1914: 233–4.
- Pound, Omar S. and Philip Grover, eds. *Wyndham Lewis: A Descriptive Bibliography*. Folkestone: Dawson, 1978.
- Pugh, Martin. *The Making of Modern British Politics, 1967–1945*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Punter, David. *A Companion to the Gothic*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- . 'Hungry Ghosts and Foreign Bodies.' *Gothic Modernisms*. Eds. Andrew Smith and Jeff Wallace. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. 167–87.
- . *The Literature of Terror*. Vol. 1. London: Longman, 1996.
- PVC. 'Why Artists Marry?' *New Age* 21 Dec. 1911: 177–8.
- Pykett, Lyn. *Engendering Fictions: The English Novel in the Early Twentieth Century*. London: Edward Arnold, 1995.
- Quintillian. 'The Reality of Life.' *Gryphon* May 1912: 74–5.
- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. 1794. Ed. Bonamy Dobrée. Oxford: OUP 1980.
- . *The Italian, or the Confessional of the Black Penitents*. 1797. Ed. Frederick Garber. Oxford: OUP, 1981.
- Rainey, Laurence. *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Rainey, Lawrence, ed. *Modernism: An Anthology*. London: Blackwell, 2005.
- Read, Herbert. *The Contrary Experience: Autobiographies*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1963.
- Rentfrow, Daphnée. 'Introduction to Volume XI of *The New Age*.' 20 Mar. 2009
http://dl.lib.brown.edu/mjp/render.php?id=mjp.2005.00.012&view=mjp_object

- Rev. of *The Clash*, by Storm Jameson. *Saturday Review* 27 May 1922: 554–5.
- Rev. of *The Clash*, by Storm Jameson. *TLS* 11 May 1922: 309.
- Rev. of *The Pot Boils*, by Storm Jameson. *Punch* 19 Feb. 1919: 151–2.
- Richter, Melvin. *The Politics of Conscience: T H Green and His Age*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964.
- Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1978.
- Rignall, John. ‘Continuity and Rupture in English Novels of the First World War: Frederic Manning and R.H. Mottram’. *Outside Modernism: In Pursuit of the English Novel, 1900–1930*. Eds. Lynne Hapgood and Nancy L. Paxton. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000. 43–62.
- Robinson, Alan. *Symbol to Vortex: Poetry, Painting and Ideas, 1885–1914*. NY: St. Martin’s, 1985.
- Rose, Jonathan. *The Edwardian Temperament: 1895–1919*. Ohio: Ohio UP, 1986.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love*. London: Verso, 2008.
- Royle, Nicholas. *The Uncanny*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003.
- Ruskin, John. *Sesame and Lilies*. 1865. London: Allen and Unwin, 1919.
- . *The Stones of Venice*. Vol. 2. 1853. London: Allen and Unwin, 1925.
- Ryan, Judith. *The Vanishing Subject: Early Psychology and Literary Modernism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.
- Sadler, Michael. *The Northanger Novels: A Footnote to Jane Austen*. Pamphlet No. 68. The English Association. Nov. 1927.
- Saler, Michael T. *The Avant-Garde in Interwar England*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.
- Samuel, Raphael. *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain. Theatres of Memory, Vol II*. London: Verso, 1998.
- Sandra. ‘Lines to a Lost Ideal – on the Editorial Staff having fallen on Evil Days.’ *Gryphon* May 1911: 85.
- Sargent, M. Elizabeth and Garry Watson. ‘D. H. Lawrence and the Dialogic Principle: “The Strange Reality of Otherness”?’ *College English* 63 (2001): 409–37.
- Schnitz, Albert. ‘Co-education in America.’ *New Age* 21 Dec. 1911: 175–8.
- Scholes, Robert. ‘General Introduction to *The New Age, 1907–1922*.’ 20 Mar. 2009
<http://dl.lib.brown.edu:8081/exist/mjp/display.xq?docid=mjp.2005.00.001>

- Scholes, Robert. 'Hastings, Beatrice (1879–1943). 20 Mar. 2009
<http://dl.lib.brown.edu:8081/exist/mjp/plookup.xq?id=HastingsBeatrice>>
- . *Paradoxy of Modernism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime, ed. *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
- . *Refiguring Modernism, Vol II: Postmodern Feminist Readings of Woolf, West, and Barnes*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995.
- Seymour, Miranda. *Ottoline Morrell: Life on a Grand Scale*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1992.
- Shaw, Marion. "'Alien Experiences': Virginia Woolf, Winifred Holtby and Vera Brittain in the Thirties.' *Rewriting the Thirties: Modernism and After*. Eds. Keith Williams and Steven Matthews. London: Longmans, 1997. 37–51.
- . *The Clear Stream: A Life of Winifred Holtby*. London: Virago, 1999.
- Sherry, Vincent. *Ezra Pound, Wyndham Lewis and Radical Modernism*. Oxford: OUP, 1993.
- . *The Great War and the Language of Modernism*. Oxford: OUP, 2003.
- Shimmin, A.N. *The University of Leeds: The First Half-Century*. London: CUP, 1954
- Siegel, Carol. *Lawrence Among the Women*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1991.
- Simpson, Hilary. *D. H. Lawrence and Feminism*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois UP, 1982.
- Smith, Andrew. 'Vampirism, Masculinity and Degeneracy: D. H. Lawrence's Modernist Gothic.' *Gothic Modernisms*. Eds. Andrew Smith and Jeff Wallace. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. 150–66.
- Smith, Andrew and Jeff Wallace, eds. *Gothic Modernisms*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Squier, Susan M. 'Rose Macaulay'. *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. 252–60.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Steele, Tom. *Alfred Orage and the Leeds Arts Club*. Aldershot: Scolar, 1990.
- Stone, Dan. *Breeding Superman: Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in Edwardian and Interwar Britain*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2002.
- Swinnerton, Frank. *The Georgian Literary Scene*. London: Dent, 1938.
- Tanner, Micheal. *Nietzsche: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 1994.
- Tartar. 'The Gryph (Tune: "McPherson").' *Gryphon* June 1910: 89.

- Tew, Philip and Alex Murray, eds. *The Modernism Handbook*. London: Continuum, 2009.
- Thacker, Andrew. 'Dora Marsden and *The Egoist*: "Our War is With Words".' *ELT* 36 (1993): 179–96.
- . 'Mapping the Current Critical Landscape.' *The Modernism Handbook*. Eds. Philip Tew and Alex Murray. London: Continuum, 2009. 186–98.
- Thatcher, David S. *Nietzsche in England, 1890–1914: The Growth of a Reputation*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1970.
- Thieme, John. *Postcolonial Con-Texts: Writing Back to the Canon*. London: Continuum, 2001.
- Tiffin, Helen. 'Post-colonial Literatures and Counter-discourse.' *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft et al. London: Routledge, 1995. 95–8.
- Trodd, Anthea. *Women's Writing in English: Britain 1900–1945*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Tsuzuki, Chushichi. *Edward Carpenter: Prophet of Human Fellowship, 1884–1929*. Cambridge: CUP, 1980.
- 'Turn Duke's Mansion over to the Movies.' *New York Times* 9 May 1920:17. 28 Nov. 2009 <<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9C06E3DE153AE03ABC4E53DFBF668382609EDE>>
- 'The Union "At Home".' *Gryphon* Dec. 1911: 26.
- Upward, Allen. *The Divine Mystery: A Reading of the History of Christianity down to the Time of Christ*. Santa Barbara: Ross-Erikson, 1978.
- Vance, Sylvia. 'The Art of Peace: Pacifism and Women Writers of the 1930s.' Diss. Oxford U, 1997.
- . 'The Rise of Fascism and the Work of Storm Jameson.' *Women Writers of the 1930s: Gender, Politics and History*. Ed. Maroula Joannou. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999. 123–37.
- Vaughan, C. E. *The Romantic Revolt*. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1907.
- . *Types of Tragic Drama*. London: Macmillan, 1908.
- Wallace, Jeff. *D. H. Lawrence, Science and the Posthuman*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Watney, Simon. *The Art of Duncan Grant*. London: Murray, 1990.
- Weber, Samuel. Introduction. *The Legend of Freud*. Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1999. 28 Nov. 2009 <<http://hydra.humanities.uci.edu/weber/legend.html>>
- Weir, David. *Anarchy and Culture: The Aesthetic Politics of Modernism*. Amherst: UP of Mass., 1997.

- Wells, H. G. *The History of Mr. Polly*. 1910. London: Collins, 1953.
- . *Kipps*. 1905. London: Collins, 1961.
- . *A Modern Utopia*. 1905. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1967.
- . *The New Machiavelli*. London: Lane, 1911.
- . *The Wheels of Chance*. London: Dent, 1896.
- West, Rebecca. Rev. of *The Clash*, by Storm Jameson. *New Statesman*. 27 May 1922: 213.
- W.G. 'University Working Men's Club.' *Gryphon* Dec. 1911: 21.
- W.G.G. 'The Reality of Unreality.' *Gryphon* June 1912: 93.
- Whistler, Theresa. *Imagination of the Heart: The Life of Walter de la Mare*. London: Duckworth, 1993.
- White, Allon. 'Pigs and Pierrots: The Politics of Transgression in Modern Fiction.' *Modern Fiction* 2.2. (1982): 51–6.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*. London: Verso, 1989.
- Wilt, Judith. 'The Ghost and the Omnibus: the Gothic Virginia Woolf.' *Gothic Modernisms*. Eds. Andrew Smith and Jeff Wallace. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. 62–77.
- . *Ghosts of the Gothic: Austen, Eliot and Lawrence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1980.
- Woolf, Virginia. *The Common Reader*. NY: Harcourt Brace, 1925.
- . *The Complete Shorter Fiction of Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Susan Dick. London: Hogarth, 1985.
- . *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Anne Olivier Bell. 5 vols. London: Hogarth, 1978.
- . *The Essays of Virginia Woolf: 1919–1924*. Ed. Andrew McNeillie. Vol. 3. London: Hogarth, 1988.
- . 'Middlebrow: To the Editor of the "New Statesman".' Woolf. *The Death of the Moth*. NY: Harcourt Brace, 1942. 176–86.
- . *Mrs. Dalloway*. 1925. London: Granada, 1976.
- . *Night and Day*. 1919. London: Grafton, 1978.
- . *To the Lighthouse*. 1927. London: Granada, 1977.
- . *The Voyage Out*. 1915. Ed. and introd. Jane Wheare. London: Penguin, 1992.
- Worthen, John. *D. H. Lawrence: The Early Years, 1885–1912*. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.

Worthen, John. *D. H. Lawrence: The Life of an Outsider*. London: Penguin, 2005.

W.W. 'Post-Impressionism.' *Gryphon* Mar. 1912: 54–5.

Zwerdling, Alex. *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*. Berkley: U of California P, 1986.

Unpublished Archive Material

Subscriptions to the *Egoist*: 1915–1920. Add. 57362. Harriet Shaw Weaver Papers. British Lib.

Journals

The Egoist. 1914–19. Warwick U Lib.

The Gryphon. 1910–12. Brotherton Collection. Leeds U Lib.

The New Age. 1907–22. 28 Nov. 2009 <<http://dl.lib.brown.edu/mjp/>>

The New Commonwealth. 1919–21. British Newspaper Lib., Colindale.

The New Freewoman. June-Dec. 1913. Warwick U Lib.